

AUG 21 1950

# College and Research Libraries

Indexing and Abstracting Services

Subject Bibliographies, Indexes and Subject  
Catalogs

Mechanization of Subject Information

Regional Cooperation in Library Service

Microfilming Abroad

Library Building Construction, 1950

A.R.L. Report

Report of A.C.R.L. Executive Secretary

Vol. XI, No. 3, Part I, July, 1950 *copy 2*  
Association of College and Reference Libraries



# Association of College and Reference Libraries

## Officers for 1949-50

**PRESIDENT:** Wyllis E. Wright, Librarian, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

**VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT-ELECT:** Charles M. Adams, Librarian, Woman's College, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N.C.

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:** Arthur T. Hamlin, A.L.A. Headquarters, 50 East Huron St., Chicago.

**TREASURER:** Thomas S. Shaw, Assistant in Charge, Public Reference, Main Reading Room, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

**PAST PRESIDENT:** Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

**DIRECTORS:** Mary R. Kinney, Associate Professor, School of Library Science, Simmons College, Boston, Mass.; Elizabeth Neal, Librarian, Compton Junior College, Compton, Calif.; Anne M. Smith, Head, Reference Dept., University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

**A.C.R.L. REPRESENTATIVES ON A.L.A. COUNCIL:** Johanna E. Allerding, Librarian, Engineering Library, University of California, Los Angeles; Robert W. Christ, Assistant Librarian, Duke University, Durham, N.C.; Donald T. Clark, Associate Librarian, Graduate School of Business Administration,

Harvard University, Boston, Mass.; Edith M. Coulter, Associate Professor, School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley; J. Periam Danton, Dean, School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley; William H. Hyde, Librarian, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago; Florence L. King, Librarian, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.; Jean F. Macalister, Reference Department, University of California Library, Los Angeles 24, Calif.; Arthur M. McAnally, Assistant Director of Libraries, University of Illinois, Urbana; Harriet Dorothea MacPherson, Dean, School of Library Science, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa.; Foster E. Mohrhardt, Director, Library Service, U.S. Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.; John H. Moriarty, Director of Libraries, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Gerhard B. Naeeth, Associate Director in Charge of Technical Services, University of Wisconsin Library, Madison; G. Flint Purdy, Director, Wayne University Library, Detroit, Mich.; Dorothy M. Sinclair, Head, History, Travel, and Biography Departments, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.; Edwin E. Williams, Assistant to the Librarian, Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Mass.

## Section Officers, 1949-50

### *Agricultural Libraries Section*

**Chairman:** Nelle U. Branch, Librarian, College of Agriculture, University of California, Davis, California; **Secretary,** Whiton Powell; **Director,** Louise O. Bercaw.

### *College Libraries Section*

**Chairman:** Wyman W. Parker, Librarian, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio; **Vice chairman and chairman-elect,** Eileen Thornton; **Secretary,** David Wilder; **Director,** H. G. Bousfield.

### *Engineering School Libraries Section*

**Chairman:** Johanna E. Allerding, Librarian, Engineering Library, University of California, Los Angeles 24, California; **Secretary,** Francis H. Wilson; **Director,** William H. Hyde.

### *Junior College Libraries Section*

**Chairman:** Frances L. Meals, Librarian, Colby Junior College, New London, New Hampshire; **Vice chairman**

**and chairman-elect,** Lola Rivers Thompson; **Secretary,** Ruth Ellen Scarborough; **Director,** C. Lawrence Lynn.

### *Reference Librarians Section*

**Chairman:** Dorothy M. Black, Associate Reference Librarian, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois; **Vice chairman and chairman-elect,** Milton Russell; **Secretary,** Marjory H. Drake; **Director,** Winifred Ver Nooy.

### *Libraries of Teacher Training Institutions Section*

**Chairman:** Frances G. Hepinstall, Librarian, State Teachers College, Buffalo, New York; **Secretary and chairman-elect,** Miss Marion Grady, Librarian, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.; **Director,** Donna E. Sullivan, Librarian, State Teachers College, Fredonia, N.Y.

### *University Libraries Section*

**Chairman:** Guy R. Lyle, Director of Libraries, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; **Secretary,** Samuel W. McAllister; **Director,** Robert B. Downs.

# College and Research Libraries

MAURICE F. TAUBER, *Editor*

## EDITORIAL STAFF

Buildings .....	RALPH E. ELLSWORTH
Methods .....	JENS NYHOLM
News .....	JOHN H. BERTHEL
Personnel .....	BYRON C. HOPKINS
Resources .....	ROBERT B. DOWNS

*College and Research Libraries* is the official organ of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, a division of the American Library Association. It includes general articles, official reports, addresses of conference speakers, reviews of selected books, and news from the field of wide professional interest.

Manuscripts of articles and addresses should be addressed to the Office of the Editor, Columbia University Library, New York City 27. Requests for reprints should be addressed to Editor, *A.L.A. Bulletin*, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago 11, at the time the notification is received of the issue in which the article is scheduled to appear. The scope of the journal does not permit inclusion of personal communications or exhaustive coverage by reviews of the literature of librarianship.

To editors: Material in *College and Research Libraries* is not copyrighted. No comment or pronouncement can be cited as official endorsement of the Association of College and Reference Libraries or of the American Library Association. Such action can only be taken through a formal vote of the associations. The assumption of editorial responsibility is not to be construed necessarily as endorsement of opinions expressed by writers.

Subscription price: to members of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, \$3 per year; to others, \$4 in the U.S., Canada, and Latin America; in other countries, \$4.25; single copy, \$1.25.

Payment for subscriptions should be made to the American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago 11.

Members of the American Library Association may become members of the Association of College and Reference Libraries by indicating this as the division of their choice when paying A.L.A. dues, without the payment of additional dues. A.L.A. members wishing to belong to more than one division must pay to the A.L.A. an additional 20 per cent of their A.L.A. dues for each additional division.

*College and Research Libraries* is published quarterly, January, April, July, and October at 50 E. Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill., by the American Library Association, and printed at 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis. Entered as second-class matter May 3, 1940, at the post office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of March 3, 1879, with an additional entry at Menasha, Wis.

## Change of Address

It is important for subscribers ordering a change of address to give three weeks' notice, to provide both their old and new addresses, and to send the information to *College and Research Libraries*, Subscriptions Department, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill.

# Snead & Company, ORANGE, VIRGINIA

Division of Angus Snead Macdonald Corporation

## Welcomes You to the 1950 Convention

Our representatives are registered in the Hotel Statler in Cleveland,  
and will be glad to discuss library problems and projects with you.



### PARTIAL LIST OF SNEAD SYSTEM POST WAR INSTALLATIONS

University of Alberta .....	Edmonton, Alberta
University of British Columbia .....	Vancouver, B.C.
University of California .....	Los Angeles, Calif.
Hardin-Simmons University (Modular Const. Louverall Lghtg) .....	Abilene, Texas
University of Louvain (1) .....	Louvain, Belgium
University of Minnesota (Book Conveyor) .....	Minneapolis, Minn.
University of New Mexico .....	Albuquerque, N.M.
Princeton University (Book Conveyor) .....	Princeton, N.J.
St. Andrews University (2) .....	Scotland
Gustavus Adolphus College .....	St. Peter, Minn.
Iowa State College Atomic Laboratory .....	Ames, Iowa
LeMay College .....	Syracuse, N.Y.
Texas Lutheran College .....	Seguin, Texas
Mississippi State College .....	State College, Miss.
North Dakota Agricultural College (Modular Construction) .....	Fargo, N.D.
United Nations Library & Secretariat (Conveyors) .....	New York, N.Y.
Parliamentary Library of Victoria .....	Victoria, B.C.
National Library of Peru (1) .....	Lima, Peru
National Scottish Library (2) .....	Edinburgh, Scotland
National Library of Sydney (3) .....	Sydney, Australia
Archives of the Marine (1) .....	France
St. Paul Public Library .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Library of the Ministry of Fine Arts (1) .....	Paris, France
Luther Theological Seminary .....	St. Paul, Minn.
St. Paul Seminary .....	St. Paul, Minn.
Tennessee Agricultural & Industrial Institute .....	Nashville, Tenn.
University of North Dakota Law Library .....	Grand Forks, N.D.
Michigan State Normal College .....	Ypsilanti, Mich.
Mid-West Inter-Library Center .....	Chicago, Ill.

(1) In cooperation with Forges de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France.

(2) In cooperation with Luxfer Ltd., London, England.

(3) In cooperation with Steelbilt Limited, Sydney, Australia.

The Globe-Wernicke Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, with a great plant of 26 acres of floor space and unexcelled machinery and personnel for manufacturing the highest grade of steel and wood furniture and cabinet work, cooperates with Snead Company in the execution of library equipment contracts.

### SNEAD products

- Steel Bookstacks, Single and Multitier
- Snead Modular Construction
- Deck Floors, Concrete, Steel, Marble, etc.
- Stack Stairs and Elevator Enclosures
- Automatic Book Conveyors
- Carrels, Study Units and Office Enclosures
- Movable Partitions
- Louverall Ceiling Lighting & Acoustical Treatment
- Stack Accessories
- Wood Library Furniture and Equipment, newly designed for improved functional value and charm.

Charging Desks	Exhibit Cases
Catalog Cases	Chairs
Tables	Technical Equipment
Shelving	Study Units

Detailed description of the above sent upon request.

# College and Research Libraries

## Contents

INDEXING AND ABSTRACTING: RECENT PAST AND LINES OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT. By <i>Verner Clapp</i> .....	197
RELATIVE USEFULNESS OF INDEXING AND ABSTRACTING SERVICES. By <i>George S. Bonn</i> .....	207
SUBJECT BIBLIOGRAPHY <i>Versus</i> SUBJECT CATALOG AND PERIODICAL INDEX. By <i>Rutherford D. Rogers</i> .....	211
DUPLICATION OF SUBJECT ENTRIES IN THE CATALOG OF A UNIVERSITY LIBRARY AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. By <i>Wesley Simonton</i> .....	215
CONTROL OF SUBJECT INFORMATION: CAN IT BE MECHANIZED? By <i>Roger Pat-trell Bristol</i> .....	222
A NEW MECHANISM IN THE ORGANIZATION OF LIBRARY SERVICE IN THE NORTH-EAST. By <i>Carl M. White</i> .....	228
A PROPOSAL FOR A NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL LIBRARY. By <i>Keyes D. Metcalf</i> ...	238
LIBRARY COOPERATION IN METROPOLITAN NEW YORK: REPORT OF WORK IN PROGRESS. By <i>Morris A. Gelfand</i> .....	245
MICROFILMING ABROAD. By <i>Lester K. Born</i> .....	250
LIBRARY BUILDING CONSTRUCTION AMONG COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1950. By <i>Robert H. Muller</i> .....	259
A BRIEF OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, A.C.R.L., CHICAGO .....	262
PLANS COMPLETED FOR THE MIDWEST INTER-LIBRARY CENTER BUILDING .....	264
BRIEF OF MINUTES, ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES, JAN. 26, 1950, CHI-CAGO .....	265
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE A.C.R.L. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, 1949-50. By <i>Arthur T. Hamlin</i> .....	271
NEWS FROM THE FIELD .....	276
PERSONNEL .....	279
APPOINTMENTS .....	279
RETIREMENTS .....	280
REVIEW ARTICLES	
Scientific Information, <i>Thomas P. Fleming</i> .....	281
Source Material on Meteorology, <i>Edward J. Doherty, Jr.</i> .....	283
Library Education, <i>Kenneth R. Shaffer; Nathaniel Stewart</i> .....	284

July, 1950

Volume XI, Number 3, Part I

Choose any number  
from **1** to **4**....  
and make your job easier

**1 The New York Times Index**

This is *more* than an index to the news in The New York Times...it's your guide to the news facts buried in any newspaper that you file. Published twice monthly, and in an annual cumulative volume, it gives you over 500,000 news facts every year arranged alphabetically under thousands of different headings. 24 semi-monthly issues, \$35; annual volume, \$35 (\$36 foreign). Combined semi-monthly and annual volume, \$50 (\$51 foreign). *Out of print* volumes of the Index may now be had in *Microfilm* or *Microcard* editions.

**2 The New York Times On Microfilm**

Here's the complete final edition of The New York Times on durable, space-saving 35 mm. microfilm. Three small reels give you a full month's file of the weekday and Sunday editions. Mailed to subscribers every ten days. Files from 1851 are available on microfilm. Subscription for current year, \$140 (\$144 foreign). Back years 1939-1949, \$175 each. Prices quoted on request for years 1851-1938.

**3 The New York Times Rag-Paper Edition**

When you want full size copies of The New York Times that will take a lot of punishment, *the daily* rag-paper edition is the answer. Copies may be purchased singly (75¢ weekday, \$1.25 Sunday) or by yearly subscription. A year's file on rag paper: unbound, \$225; bound, \$300. (Transportation extra on foreign subscriptions.)

**4 The New York Times Bound Newsprint Edition**

You can get the weekday and Sunday issues of The New York Times (including the Book Review and The New York Times Magazine) in handy bound volumes ready for delivery on the 15th and 30th of each month. Annual subscription, \$150. (Transportation extra on foreign subscriptions.)

Send your order or request for further information to:

**THE NEW YORK TIMES LIBRARY SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

229 West 43 Street, New York 18, N. Y.

## Indexing and Abstracting: Recent Past and Lines of Future Development<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Clapp is chief assistant librarian, Library of Congress.

BY THE 1930's, the great push toward comprehensive bibliographical control of periodical and monographic literature, with which the century had commenced, was definitely over, and attention was directed to the basis rather than to the actuality of control. The century had started bravely. There was the *International Catalog of Scientific Literature* which produced 254 volumes in 20 series between 1902 and 1921; the *Concilium Bibliographicum*, perhaps the best known of the card services in science, established in 1890; the publications of the H. W. Wilson Company, 1901+; the *Bibliographie der Deutschen Zeitschriften-Literatur*, 1896+; *Chemical Abstracts*, 1907+; the *Engineering Index*, 1892 and 1907+; the Universal Catalog at Brussels, 1895+; etc.

But by the thirties the great push was over. Some of the more monumental attempts had perished; others were struggling for support; still others were flourishing, and even expanding, but there was no longer the same hope or expectation that comprehensive control might shortly be attained. The history of *Biological Abstracts* (1926+) and of *Social Science Abstracts* (1927-1933), as well as the tribulations of the *Index Catalogue of the Surgeon General's Library* and *Index Medicus* would

alone have been sufficient to dampen any ardors in this country. The energies which had previously gone into attempts at comprehensive control were now turned to analysis, to the production of ancillary devices and to "coordination" of existing activities. The end product, the production of bibliographic controls themselves, were left to sporadic initiative, some with support from international organizations, some on a commercial basis, some devised by members of professional associations for their own use, some supplied by institutions with interest or responsibility in a particular subject. There was, however, no attempt at comprehensive organization of bibliographical services; and among the bibliographical services themselves there was no such organization, no interrelation, no coordination, but, on the contrary, duplication, overlapping, gaps, uncontrolled multiplication. In 1931 the second edition of the *Index Bibliographicus* listed 273 current bibliographical services in the field of medicine alone.

The decade before World War II was then a period of exploration of the bases for action, rather than of substantive action itself. On the international plane this preparation is represented by the formation of the International Library Committee in 1927, resulting in the first International Congress on Libraries and Bibliography in Rome in 1929. Almost immediately thereafter (1930) the International Federation of Library Associations was formed, to con-

<sup>1</sup> Paper read at meeting of Serials Round Table, A.L.A. Midwinter Meeting, Chicago, Jan. 27, 1950.

tinue the international congresses at five-year intervals. One other congress met before the war, at Madrid in 1935, and the third is only now being planned. Still on the international plane, the League of Nations responded to requests to establish a center for the coordination of intellectual activities, and the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was established in Paris in 1926. It had, among other organs, a Library Coordinating Service in its Section of Scientific Relations. This service interested itself in standards of bibliographical work, in the establishment of national information centers; it sponsored the *Index Bibliographicus* of Vorstius and Godet, and issued the *Index Translationum*. Still another international organization girded itself for action. The International Institute of Bibliography which sponsored the Universal Catalog at Brussels in its first meeting in 1895, had become the International Institute of Documentation by 1931. In 1937 it became the International Federation for Documentation, the principal objective of which was to promote, through affiliated national groups, the use of the Universal Decimal Classification.

In England, Samuel C. Bradford, with A. F. C. Pollard, founded the British Society for International Bibliography in 1927. Bradford himself became keeper of the Science Library in South Kensington and promptly installed the U.D.C., creating an immense catalog of scientific periodical articles arranged according to this classification, by clipping author abstracts whenever possible from the journals of original publication.<sup>2</sup> This catalog has recently been described as a "white elephant."<sup>3</sup> Throughout the 30's and until his death in 1948, Bradford was active in analysis and discus-

sion of the bases for comprehensive bibliographical control, with full realization that the unit of scientific communication is, for the most part, the periodical article. His bibliography on bibliographical subjects, recently published by Miss Dittmas,<sup>4</sup> must be used by anyone interested in the subject of bibliographical control. His calculation, obtained with the help of Ernest Lancaster-Jones, of the quantity of scientific publication (estimated at 750,000 articles per annum) and of the amount of this publication covered by abstracting journals (ca. 250,000 articles annually abstracted on the average of three times each, resulting in a total of ca. 750,000 abstracts; meanwhile, ca. 500,000 articles not abstracted at all)<sup>5</sup> is frequently quoted; and his "Law of Scattering" recently reduced to a logarithmic curve, has expressed in mathematical terms a phenomenon of common observation.<sup>6</sup>

In the United States a similar situation obtained. The Bibliography Committee of the A.L.A. conducted a vigorous existence, under the chairmanship of Ernest Cushing Richardson, into the thirties. But the problems of periodicals required more specific attention than the Bibliography Committee could give, and in 1929 the A.L.A. Council authorized the creation of the Periodicals Section, whose name was changed in 1938 to the Serials Section. In spite of the existence of the section, the Executive Board authorized the creation of a Periodicals Committee in 1936. The work of the Periodicals (later Serials) Section in indexing and abstracting is well known. Its Committee on Indexing and Abstracting published still-valuable surveys in the field;<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Dittmas, *op. cit.*, p. 172-174.

<sup>3</sup> Bradford, S. C., "The Extent to Which Scientific and Technical Literature is Covered by Present Abstracting and Indexing Periodicals." In *Report of Proceedings*, (Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux), 14:59-71, 1937.

<sup>4</sup> Vickery, B. C., "Bradford's Law of Scattering." *Journal of Documentation*, 4:198-203, 1949.

<sup>5</sup> Vickery, B. C., "Bradford's Law of Scattering." *Journal of Documentation*, 4:198-203, 1949.

<sup>7</sup> A.L.A. Serials Section. Committee on Indexes

in 1937 it proposed the creation of a joint committee to study the problem; in January 1938 the Executive Board created a Joint Committee on Indexing and Abstracting in the Major Fields of Research "to formulate a plan for the study and solution of the most pressing problems connected with the publication of indexing and abstracting services covering the literature of the several scientific, humanistic, social science, learned, professional, and business fields; and, if financial support can be obtained, to carry out the plan." Nine other associations were invited to participate in the work of the joint committee; it is interesting after the event, to note that neither the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the International Federation of Library Associations, nor the Special Libraries Association ever appointed a member. The joint committee worked for eight years; it would appear that all of its substantive work was done by its A.L.A. representative; though it was never able to secure funds for its support, it produced some still-useful studies;<sup>8</sup> it eventually produced a plan for bibliographical control which was published in its final report.<sup>9</sup>

It was there proposed that the United States Government, acting through learned bodies and libraries, should undertake the preparation of a general indexing and abstracting program which would be financed by groups already operating bibliographical services, by associations benefiting from the use of such services, and by government subsidies. The producing unit should be operated at, but not necessarily by, the Library of Congress. The resultant indexing and

abstracting service would consolidate or supersede all those currently appearing and provide uniform and complete coverage in all subject fields in accordance with a schedule which included indexes to the various classes of publications, special aids such as poetry and play indexes, and abstracting services prepared by discipline. But this proposal was not accompanied by an estimate of cost, and it fell on deaf ears.

Meanwhile, the war had swept away the great German bibliographical services; it had in one way or another added to the burdens of services everywhere; it had increased the amount of publication in the surviving countries; and it had brought to the fore a new form of publication—the research report reproduced by mimeograph or otherwise from typed copy. At the same time it had stimulated research and whetted appetites for information which would not be satisfied with existing mechanisms; and it had made many members of the groups which had not participated in the work of the joint committee keenly aware, at last, of the problems of bibliographical control.

The noises of war had hardly died away when the cries for improved bibliographical control began to arise. Mrs. Cowles' report for the joint committee, though in a sense completing the work of the thirties, was actually made after the end of hostilities. At just about the same time Dr. Vannevar Bush's well known report, *Science, the Endless Frontier*, made proposals very similar to those of Mrs. Cowles.<sup>10</sup> These, however, were stimulated by the recent experience of the war, as, too, were the proposals made to Unesco at its preliminary conferences in London in 1945 and 1946<sup>11</sup> when the representatives

and Abstracting Services. "Tabular Analyses of 550 Titles in the Field of Periodicals Indexing and Abstracting." *Library Journal*, 62:354-57, 1939.

<sup>8</sup> "Preliminary Survey of Indexes and Abstracting Services, with Special Emphasis on the Fields of Industrial Arts and Chemistry." *Library Journal*, 63:265-71, 1938.

<sup>9</sup> Produced in the form of mimeographed circular letters: No. 1, Feb. 21, 1942; No. 2, May 1, 1943.

<sup>10</sup> A.L.A. Bulletin, 39:370-71, 426-27, Oct. 15, 1945.

<sup>10</sup> U. S. Office of Scientific Research and Development. *Science, the Endless Frontier. A Report to the President by Vannevar Bush, Director.* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945, p. 120.

<sup>11</sup> Preparatory Commission for Unesco (Fifth Session, London, 1946). *Progress Report on the Programme of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural*

of many disciplines made almost unanimous demands for services which would enable them to ascertain what was going on in their fields of activity, by means of bibliographies, indexes and abstracts.

Here in the United States we have seen since the war the development of much activity in or relating to this field. One of the earliest acts of President Truman was to provide for the establishment of the Publication Board which, through the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce, has abstracted and indexed a great mass of the research reports in separate form which resulted from wartime inquiry, both domestic and foreign.<sup>12</sup> Among other bibliographical devices for the control of the newborn separate research report may be mentioned the bibliographical services of the Central Air Documents Office at Wright Field, the *Technical Information Pilot* produced for the Office of Naval Research by the Library of Congress, and *Nuclear Physics Abstracts* issued by the Atomic Energy Commission. Nor have services of the more usual types been wanting, though their production has in more than one instance been made possible by the application of new techniques (a point I want to emphasize)—the *Bibliography of Agriculture*, the *Monthly List of Russian Accessions*, the *Current List of Medical Literature*, the *Bibliography of Periodical Literature on the Near and Middle East*—representing attempts by individual institutions to meet currently some of the most pressing indexing problems which come to their attention. All these are additional instances of multiplication of bibliographical services, and made no contribution to coordination or integration.

There have, however, been activities at

the planning level—attempts to analyze and if possible to rationalize the situation with a view to closing the gaps once and for all and for bringing order among the existing services.

The problems of subject bibliography, including indexing and abstracting, were, for example, considered at the Princeton Conference on International Educational, Cultural and Scientific Exchanges in the fall of 1946. This conference was called to consider library programs which might be recommended to Unesco, as well as U.S. action in relation to such programs, and the preliminary memoranda, prepared by Edwin E. Williams and Ruth V. Noble, which have since been published, remain excellent summaries of previous action and proposals in these fields. In bibliographic matters the Conference made a number of specific recommendations to various bodies, chiefly dealing with the completion of the U.S. and other national bibliographies, but in the field of indexing and abstracting the Conference merely called attention to the need for "greater international cooperation."<sup>13</sup>

An outstanding example of the continuing focusing of interest upon problems of documentation is provided by the American Chemical Society in which a special Division of Chemical Literature has been formed to provide a forum for those interested in the problems relating to the publication, translation, classification, coding and machine handling of scientific information.

A very precise inquiry has been the one conducted by the American Institute of Physics under a contract with the Office of Naval Research into requirements of indexing and abstracting services by American physicists, and the adequacy of the services

Organization. Unesco/Prep. Com./51, London, July 3, 1946).

<sup>12</sup> U. S. Publication Board. *Bibliography of Scientific and Industrial Reports*. Washington, U. S. Department of Commerce, Jan. 11, 1946+. Weekly, later monthly.

<sup>13</sup> Conference on International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges (Princeton, Nov. 25-26, 1946). Preliminary Memoranda by Edwin E. Williams [and] Ruth V. Noble. Recommendations Adopted. Summary of Discussion. Chicago, American Library Association, 1947, p. xvi.

now available to them.<sup>14</sup> This study began in the early fall of 1948 and its final report is now being written. It has made some pertinent findings, which must be taken into consideration in any planning of indexing and abstracting services. It was found, among other things, that American physicists rate wide coverage and promptness as more important than the preparation of abstracts by experts and the issuance of extensive indexes; that about 900 journals carry material of interest to physicists; that in the principal physics abstracting journal the abstracts follow original publication with an average lag of four months unless it exceeds a year; that 47 per cent of the articles abstracted in *Physics Abstracts* during the first six months of 1948 were also abstracted in *Chemical Abstracts*.<sup>15</sup>

More recently, the Graduate Library School and the Division of the Social Sciences of the University of Chicago have undertaken a study to ascertain the possible bases for bibliographic services in the field of the social sciences. The final report of the survey has recently been published. It recommends increased collaboration and integration of existing services now serving the social sciences and the creation of two new services in the social sciences field—one of bibliographical reviews and one of selective abstracts.<sup>16</sup>

During this same period the Army Medical Library has been re-examining its bibliographical procedures. One immediate result has been the construction of the new medical book classification Class "W". One of the library's principal problems, however, has

been to make a decision regarding the *Index Catalogue of the Surgeon General's Library*, commenced in 1880, now in its 59th volume, but with a backlog of a million and a half entries and ever-increasing arrearages. Although coordination between the *Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus* and the *Index Catalogue* was attempted back in the thirties, this coordination did not work out, and the two publications have each since pursued its way, the one covering the literature currently, the other providing more nearly comprehensive coverage, but at an interval. The Army Medical Library also publishes, however, for the current literature, the *Current List of Medical Literature*, which is essentially a transcript of the tables of contents of some 1800 journals. To advise the library with respect to these indexing problems the Surgeon General of the Army appointed in 1948 a Consultative Committee on the Medical Indexes published by the Army Medical Library. In response to the committee's desire for an agency to dig out facts, to experiment with methods and to investigate particular problems, the Surgeon General has also contracted with the Johns Hopkins University for the conduct of a research project in the subject of medical indexing. This project, under the direction of the librarian of the Welch Medical Library, Dr. Sanford V. Larkey, has made inquiries into the use of medical indexes and abstracting services. By medical scientists, it has commenced studies of medical subject headings and of scope and coverage of various indexing and abstracting services, and it has some experiments with punched cards well under way.

Certain other useful experimentation in procedures in connection with indexing and abstracting media have been performed by the Department of Agriculture Library, the Central Air Documents Center at Wright Field and the Library of Congress.

<sup>14</sup> Bray, R. S. "The Physics Abstracting Study of the American Institute of Physics." *Special Libraries*, 40:248-50, 1949.

<sup>15</sup> American Institute of Physics. "Physics Abstracting Study." Mimeographed reports and memoranda. AIP/45: PR-13, Appendix, Oct. 1, 1949; AIP/45: M-9, Jan. 11, 1949; AIP/45: M-16, Oct. 27, 1949.

<sup>16</sup> Bibliographical Services in the Social Sciences; a Report to the Carnegie Corporation by the Graduate Library School and the Division of the Social Sciences at the University of Chicago, September 1949. (Mimeographed).

The technique of photolithography from printed cards or slips, first used extensively by the Edwards Brothers for the 163-volume *Catalog of Library of Congress Printed Cards* has since been adopted by the *Library of Congress Cumulative Catalog*, the *Monthly List of Russian Accessions*, the *Technical Information Pilot*, the *Bibliography of Agriculture*, *Biological Abstracts*, etc. Photographic improvements of this technique, which make the mounting of the cards or slips unnecessary, have been perfected at Edwards Brothers. At the Library of Congress, also, printer's copy for a subject heading list has been prepared on electric typewriters controlled by a set of punched cards which could be mechanically sorted and interfiled for new editions;<sup>17</sup> and the use of this technique for future editions of the *Union List of Serials* is currently being considered.<sup>18</sup> At the Central Air Documents Office abstracts have been issued on transparent sheets which permit the recipient to make his own cards photographically.<sup>19</sup>

Abroad, the most significant action on the indexing and abstracting problem has been taken in Great Britain by the Royal Society, which has taken leadership in the matters of bibliographic control of scientific literature ever since 1867 when (at the suggestion of Joseph Henry, the first secretary of the Smithsonian Institution) it commenced publication of its *Catalogue of Scientific Papers*. In the summer of 1948 the society convened an empire-wide Conference of Scientific Information at which American observers were invited to be present and which discussed the whole range of scientific communication from the problems of initial publication to

those of documentation services.<sup>20</sup> For this conference much useful information was gathered, and the recommendations of the conference were passed on to constituent groups. For example, the (British) Library Association has since been working, as the result of one set of these recommendations, on a plan for the division of subject responsibility among libraries with a view, similar to that of the Farmington Plan, of making Britain self-contained in the matter of research literature.<sup>21</sup> At this conference, also, was presented Professor Bernal's plan for central coordinated publication of scientific papers in the form of separates, a plan which, if adopted, would undoubtedly greatly influence the form and organization of indexing and abstracting services and which has recently been echoed in Bruce L. Smith's report on the possibilities of a social science abstracting service.<sup>22</sup>

The work of the Royal Society Conference has been continued by the society's Committee on Scientific Information which has in turn sponsored a Committee on Abstracting Services. The main committee has considered the problems of a universal classification (with the tentative conclusion that none such is possible);<sup>23</sup> it has recommended, in order to promote and reduce the costs of the abstracting process, the use of "synopses" (these are abstracts, possibly prepared by the author of the articles abstracted, but in any case subjected to the same editorial scrutiny as the article itself

<sup>17</sup> [U.S.] Library of Congress, Science and Technology Project, "List of Subject Headings," Washington, 1949. Reproduced from typed copy. For method of preparation of copy see p. xv.

<sup>18</sup> Keller, A. H., "A Plan for the Development of a Union Catalog of Serials by Punched Card Methods," Washington, Library of Congress, 1950. Reproduced from typed copy.

<sup>19</sup> The Air Technical Index issued by C.A.D.O. consists of translucent sheets each containing six 3 x 5 inch forms filled in with bibliographic data, abstract, etc., describing a research report.

<sup>20</sup> The Royal Society Scientific Information Conference, June 21-July 2, 1948. *Reports and Papers Submitted*. London, The Society, 1948.

<sup>21</sup> Library Association, Library Research Committee, Working Party on Library and Information Services (Royal Society Scientific Information Conference Recommendations), "Report on the Co-operative Provision of Books, Periodicals and Related Material in Libraries," *Library of Congress Information Bulletin*, Nov. 8-14, 1949, Appendix.

<sup>22</sup> Bernal, J. D., "Provisional Scheme for Central Distribution of Scientific Publications," *Royal Society* (op. cit., note 19) p. 253-58. Cf. Smith, B. L., "Proposals for Unified Bibliographic and Reporting Systems for the Social Sciences," [Chicago, 1949.] Mimeographed p. 22-25.

<sup>23</sup> The Royal Society (London). Information Services Committee. Classification Panel: Interim Report (IS/82 (49)) [1949].

and published with it);<sup>24</sup> and it has also made recommendations regarding copyright in scientific journals in order to facilitate copying.<sup>25</sup> Besides this, the committee has stimulated the formation of an Abstracting Services Committee, one of whose first jobs has been to compile a list of the 127 science abstracting services currently published in Great Britain.<sup>26</sup>

At the international level, the problems of indexing and abstracting have had fairly continuous attention since the war. The recommendations made to Unesco by representatives of its member states in 1945 and 1946 have already been mentioned. When, in the autumn of 1946, it was learned that two rival medical abstracting services (*World Abstracts of Medicine* in England, and *Excerpta Medica* in the Netherlands) were preparing to enter the same field, Unesco called a meeting which resulted in the formation of the Coordinating Committee on Medical and Biological Abstracting. This committee has interested itself in reduction of duplication and increase of cooperation between services, and in the creation of basic tools, such as lists of periodicals and of abstracting services, which would contribute to the efficiency of all medical and biological indexing and abstracting media.<sup>27</sup>

Unesco's next step was in the direction of science indexing and abstracting, generally. A proposal, initially made by a group of experts convened to advise on the program for an international meeting, that a new international body should be formed called ICOSA or International Coordinating Office for Science Abstracts, was laid before

an International Conference on Science Abstracting and Indexing in Paris last June.<sup>28</sup> Prior to this conference the National Research Council of the U.S. called a meeting to discuss the subject, and the proposed ICOSA was unanimously rejected on grounds of being quite without prospect of the necessary financial support, and on the further grounds that the first thing for the United States to do was to put its own bibliographical house in order.<sup>29</sup> However, at the conference itself it was found that the other principal countries were of the same mind with the National Research Council, and the creation of ICOSA never really received serious consideration. Instead, the formation of national committees was recommended, each to seek order within its own jurisdiction in cooperation with other national committees, with the international scientific unions and with Unesco.<sup>30</sup> (The National Research Council now has before it a proposal for the formation of just such a committee.) The International Conference, which had before it a report from the International Federation for Documentation listing over 1000 existing indexing and abstracting services,<sup>31</sup> also recommended some basic palliative measures—the use of “synopses,” the development of union catalogs and union lists, the issuance of lists of periodicals and of the indexing and abstracting services which cover them, the study of classification, coding, terminology and translating, the development of co-operative arrangements between services, the study of a unified physics abstracting service, and the like.

Concurrently, Unesco has been conducting an inquiry into the possibilities of im-

<sup>24</sup> Guide for the Preparation of Synopses (IS/42/SEC, 12 April 1949).

<sup>25</sup> The Royal Society (London). *Declaration of Fair Dealing in regard to Copying from Scientific Periodicals*. London, The Society, 1949.

<sup>26</sup> The Royal Society (London) Abstracting Services Committee. *A List of Periodicals and Bulletins Containing Abstracts Published in Great Britain*. London, The Society, 1949.

<sup>27</sup> Unesco, Interim Coordinating Committee on Medical and Biological Abstracting (Second Session, Paris, 1949). Resolutions Adopted (NS/SAMB/5, Annex 1, Paris, May 26, 1949).

<sup>28</sup> Grivet, T. “Present State of Science Abstracting and Possible Improvements.” (Unesco/NS/SAC/1, Paris, April 15, 1949), p. 70-74.

<sup>29</sup> International Conference on Science Abstracting (Paris, June 20-25, 1949). U. S. Delegation, Report. Washington, 1949, p. 5.

<sup>30</sup> “Final Act.” (Unesco/NS/SAC/27, Paris, Aug. 1, 1949. Res. 7-9.

<sup>31</sup> International Federation for Documentation (The Hague). *List of Current Abstracting and Indexing Services*. The Hague, The Federation, 1949.

proved documentation in the social sciences, has commissioned a number of reports on this subject, and has convened a meeting of experts. It has recently, also, convoked a meeting of users of abstracts of physics and a study group on engineering documentation.<sup>32</sup>

Unesco's next major step, however, has been and still is in the field of bibliographic control generally. For two years it has had a contract with the Library of Congress. The first year's work was spent in a study in a particular field of Unesco's interest, namely fundamental education, which resulted in Mrs. Murra's report on the sources of bibliographical information in this field.<sup>33</sup> The result of the second year's work is a study of the present state of bibliographic services and of the possibilities for their improvement.<sup>34</sup> This is shortly to be published and is expected by Unesco to be used immediately as a working paper for the Third International Congress on Libraries and Bibliography which is being planned by the International Federation of Library Associations and the International Federation for Documentation.

Having participated in the preparation of the last-named report, I can affirm that it makes no startling discoveries. I trust that it will be found to have the merit of providing, in a form suitable for discussion, an outline which embraces most if not all of the points which inevitably arise in the circular discussions which ordinarily revolve about bibliographical problems. But this is

the most that can be claimed for it. Its finding can be briefly compressed; I shall say nothing of its recommendations here.

The first point I would make is that librarians, though their profession is with books and with the making and using of bibliographies, are fundamentally ignorant of the nature of bibliography. What precise standards do we have, for example, for adequacy in bibliography? Can we, on demand, supply specifications of the best arrangements for particular purposes? Can we tell when to use a classified, when a dictionary arrangement, or when another form? Can we say what the relation of these forms is to cost or preparation, to efficiency of use, to coordination between bibliographies, to the control of materials in different fields of study, to studies of varying degrees of specialization, or to further bibliographical work which may in turn be dependent upon bibliographies? Can a bibliography at the same time attempt to be "comprehensive" and yet serve the purposes of "selectivity" to those who require the latter, or must there be separate "comprehensive" and "selective" bibliographies? When is the establishment of a separate bibliographic service for a subdivision of a field justified? What constitutes justifiable duplication and overlapping? How should a comprehensive bibliographical service be organized ideally—by subject, by discipline, by language? Is a universal classification applicable to a division of fields between bibliographical services? What is the rôle of subject headings in bibliographical analysis? Is a terminology interchangeable between disciplines possible? What constitutes adequate national bibliographical service? Must everything be indexed? What may or should be omitted? What should be the priorities in bibliographical work? Where should one begin in a scheme of rationalization? Specifically, in the field of periodical indexing, is it true (as

<sup>32</sup> Unesco, Committee of Experts on Documentation in the Social Sciences. "[Reports and Documents]" Unesco/SS/AB/[various numbers], Paris, 1949.

<sup>33</sup> "Meeting of Users of Abstracts of Physics." (Dec. 19-20, 1949): [Reports and Documents] Unesco/NS/SL/Conf. 4/[various numbers], Paris, 1949-50.

<sup>34</sup> "Study Group on Engineering Documentation." (Dec. 15-16, 1949): [Reports and Documents] Unesco/NS/SA/[various numbers], Paris, 1949-50.

<sup>35</sup> Murra, K. O. "Sources of Information for Fundamental Education with Special Reference to Education for Literacy: a Preliminary Report." Washington: Library of Congress, 1948. Mimeographed.

<sup>36</sup> Unesco/LC Bibliographical Survey. *Bibliographical Services: Their Present State and Possibilities of Improvement*. Washington: Library of Congress, in press.

Bradford held) that "periodical literature must be abstracted by source, and not by subject, as hitherto"?<sup>25</sup> I submit that, in common with the rest of the world who make and use bibliographies, librarians can at best give no more than illumined opinions in response to any of these questions.

In the second place, I believe it is to be worth noticing that all bibliographical activities, even more than the original publications which they describe, depend upon mechanical devices. This is for the simple reason that *arrangement* is essential and for arrangement devices are required. A disordered list of bibliographical notes could hardly be called a bibliography; it is necessary that the notes be put into a systematic order, and that requires that the author use slips of paper, or cards, or some other device. The various devices which have been used can be classified in accordance as they serve to provide the initial record of bibliographical information, an intermediate record, or the final record; but the same device may, under varying circumstances, serve in all three capacities. Thus, a catalog card may provide the initial record, while a catalog of such cards may serve either as the final record or merely as the intermediary arrangement preliminary to reproduction in book form. Among the devices which have been put to the uses of bibliography in these capacities are:

Slips of paper or other writing materials (stelae, glyphs, shards, cuneiform tablets, papyri, parchments, etc.).

Books, including their various forms (scrolls, codexes, pamphlets, periodicals, broadsides, etc.).

Catalog cards.

Pages printed on one side, suitable for clipping and filing.

Pages printed in card form, perforated for separation and filing.

Microcards, containing not only the bibliographic description of a publication, but also

its text.

Stereotype plates, mats or flongs.

Addressograph plates and stencils.

Linotype slugs.

Reproduction proofs.

Photographic transparencies, individually, in groups, or in sequences adaptable to selection and reproduction by photoelectric servomechanisms.

Punched cards and tapes; magnetic tapes, wires and drums—similarly designed for treatment (sorting, interfiling, selection, enumeration, reproduction, etc.) by servomechanisms.

It is probable that every one of these devices with the exception of stereotype plates, has current use in bibliographical work, and some with very remarkable effect. The use of linotype slugs by the H. W. Wilson Company is an example. The card catalog, made possible by the catalog card, still provides advantages not superseded by more recent devices such as punched card and film selectors—it is indefinitely expandable while still making possible the almost instantaneous narrowing down of a search to a preselected group of items without the necessity for first examining every card in the catalog.

The truth is, however, that in view of the task to be done, all of these devices as now developed are quite inadequate. The book catalog with its pasted slip inserts which was used through the nineteenth century (and even into the twentieth by some libraries) could hardly cope with the flood of information even in book form. C. C. Jewett's suggestion, just 100 years ago, for a union catalog of stereotype plates, from which individual library catalogs might be published, might have worked if the plates hadn't warped. The printed catalog card from a source of central cataloging information has come nearer to solving the bibliographic problem than anything else—but its success has been more signal in the field of books than of periodical articles. The latter, the typical form of communication of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, are

<sup>25</sup> Bradford, S. C. "Sources of Information on Specific Subjects." *Engineering*, 137:85-86, 1934.

actually at the heart of the bibliographical problem today, and purely library techniques have contributed little to its solution. If any one of our great libraries made a complete card catalog of all the periodical articles in its collection it would require a catalog building instead of a catalog room. The remark is obvious, then, that we need a new mechanical device for bibliographic work—a device more flexible, more capacious, more speedy, more accurate and cheaper to operate, than anything we have as yet. To feed such a mechanism we need standardization of terminology and subject headings, of form of entry, of classification perhaps, and cooperative indexing and abstracting way beyond anything we now know, which would make it possible for us all to throw the results of our bibliographic work into one pool from which we all could fish. The question of translation also enters here. We cannot remain dependent upon slow human translation involving constant recourse to dictionaries. Dictionaries can be coded into computing machines and translation will, I am confident, become in large part if not wholly mechanized.

Nor have we, as librarians, as bibliographers, succeeded in rationalizing, even for the purposes of a work-day philosophy, the function of bibliography itself. What we call bibliography consists essentially of lists of works, though in these lists we permit analysis and annotation. We refuse the name bibliography, however, to the index of a book, though it analyzes the book. But we all know that it is the proper names, the actual words of a title, the terms, the formulas, the musical themes, the concepts, which are the *terminus ad quem* to which bibliographic analysis is a very rough approximation. Why then, refuse the name or the procedures of bibliography to the analytic index? Suppose our new mechanical device—it isn't invented yet, so we

may as well draft its specifications—suppose our device were to be so flexible and capacious that it would hold the entire indexes of books as well as the two or three subject headings under which we ordinarily analyze these books? And supposing the whole mass of information were so organized that the inquirer could find a series of volumes when he wanted that, or a periodical article when he wanted that, or a page in a book if all he wanted was the source of a particular minute piece of information. We would then almost have H. G. Wells' world dictionary. The feeding of such a machine would be an activity in which every bibliographer in the world would participate; the service from the machine would be a matter of drawing off information for particular purposes at particular intervals in accordance with prescribed methods.

All this may be a fantastic dream. But certainly nothing could be more fantastic than our present situation; a situation in which thousands of catalogers, indexers and abstracters in every library, newspaper office, documentation center, abstracting and indexing service and book publisher's office all over the world contribute to disorganized, heterogeneous, unrationalized, duplicating, unduly expensive, gapping, and inefficient complex of services (remember the 273 services in the field of medicine alone in 1931) which hasn't caught up with the nineteenth century let alone reached the twentieth. As librarians, we must discover that our trade is bibliography, and take responsibility accordingly. In this discipline we must employ not only our own talents, but all the talents, inventions and technical knowledge of the age. Either that, or the job of bibliography will go to others and may—possibly—get done worse there. Or else (my final alternative) we and the rapidly accelerating age will stay, bibliographically, a century or even more behind.

## Relative Usefulness of Indexing and Abstracting Services

*Mr. Bonn is librarian, Technological Institute, Northwestern University.*

INDEX and abstract services are, without question, among the most important bibliographic devices available to the scientific library for tracking down currently published information. But they have their limitations and their individual peculiarities, their lapses and their lags. Whether or not these limitations make any difference to the library depends upon the actual use to which the indexes and abstracts are put by the library and its patrons.

The library staff of the Technological Institute, Northwestern University, has just completed a study of several standard current index and abstract services to find out just what can be expected from them as aids in preparing bibliographies of relatively current literature, and how they compare with each other in the subject fields of most interest to this library. Since the Technological Institute concerns itself almost entirely with chemistry, physics, and civil, chemical, electrical and mechanical engineering, the study was made using those services of most interest and use in these particular fields.

The publications studied were *Engineering Index Service* (on cards, daily), *Industrial Arts Index*, *Chemical Abstracts*, *Science Abstracts A and B*, *British Abstracts* and *Nuclear Science Abstracts*. No foreign-language index or abstract service was surveyed, mainly because none was available

for the months during which the study was made. Since interest was centered in the services that are strictly indexing or abstracting in nature, no index or abstract section of any periodical was used.

The following questions were raised: (1) How much of any desired bibliography can be obtained by using any *one* of the standard services? (2) How much of any bibliography would be missed by *not* using any one of the services? In other words, how many unique references are picked up by any one of the services? (3) How well are foreign sources covered? (4) How thoroughly does the service cover those journals it says it covers? (5) How completely does the service cover the journals in the field? (6) How promptly does the service do its job of indexing or abstracting? Or, put another way, what is the time lag between the date the original article appeared and the date the index reference or abstract appeared?

The study was made on a purely practical basis. That is, bibliographies were prepared on subjects in (or across) the fields of interest mentioned above using the index and abstract services listed, just as one would do in preparing any required bibliography for a course, for publication, or for further study. For control purposes only those indexes dated January through July, 1949, were used, but (because of the unavoidable time lag in receiving these publications in this country, *Science Abstracts A and B* were available only through June while

*British Abstracts A* were available only through April (*B* through May).

Physics is represented by a bibliography of 44 references on electron accelerators, Bibliography A in the accompanying tables; chemistry, chemical engineering, and civil engineering are represented by a bibliography of 16 references on chlorine-dioxide and ozone usage in water treatment, Bibliography B in the tables; electrical engineering by an 18-item bibliography on telemetering, C in the tables; and mechanical engineering by a 38-item bibliography on supersonic aerodynamics, D in the tables. These subjects were suggested by persons actually needing bibliographies in these areas. The time limits were set by the library staff to bring the search to a halt somewhere while emphasizing currency. Since the bibliographies were prepared as a practical routine service, since rather narrow time limits were placed on their scope, and since only relative (rather than absolute) answers were wanted to the questions outlined, no great concern was felt because of the lengths of the resulting bibliographies. Nor was there any concern felt because the British publications were not yet available; under regular working conditions there is no choice but to take things as they come. Incidentally, *British Abstracts A* for May arrived October 10, June arrived November 28, and July, December 14. *British Abstracts B* for June arrived September 9 (July arrived October 25); the July *Science Abstracts* was received August 31.

Every reference found in any one of the services was searched for in each of the other services, not only in those dated during the seven-month period of the study but also in those dated one, two, and three months before January 1949, and in those dated August and September 1949, if they were available, in an attempt to make allowance for those services that are either

more or less prompt than average, and allowing comparison to be made among the several services on the questions originally posed. The number of references found in each index or abstract service for each bibliography were then cross-tabulated against the six questions and appropriate tabulations were made for each service on each question.

For ease of comparison among the services, a rank-order listing was made of the several publications by (1) per cent of total references found in each bibliography, (2) per cent of unique references, (3) per cent of total foreign references found in each bibliography, (4) thoroughness of coverage of journals usually indexed, (5) completeness of coverage of journals in the fields concerned, and (6) speed of getting the references indexed; and, for completeness, a composite of the other six. These relative rank-order lists are given here as Figure 1; the composite list is Figure 2.

The technique suggested can be used in making similar surveys in any subject field and for any group of index or abstract services. It has the advantages of being a thoroughly practical method using everyday operating procedures; of coming out with useful and usable bibliographies; of flexibility in selection of subject field, questions, and index services; of low, little, or no extra cost since the resulting bibliography will be or can be a part of the library's routine service function to a department or to a patron. This method will also give the librarian some idea of the usefulness of the current indexes and abstracts to the particular library in relation to the kind of reference work performed. The results reported are based on only one study. However, no appreciable variation in results has been found on such subjects as could be spot checked. The position of *Chemical Abstracts* in the field of physics is note-

FIGURE I

Rank-order Lists of Index and Abstract Services for Each Bibliography

(1) By each service's portion of the total number of references found in each bibliography:

Bibliography A (Electron Accelerators: Physics)		Bibliography B (Chlorine-Dioxide and Ozone Usage in Water Treatment: Civil and Chem. Engg. and Chem.)		Bibliography C (Telemetering: Elec. Engg.)		Bibliography D (Supersonic Aerodynamics: Mech. Engg.)	
Nuclear Sci	56.8	Chem Abst	68.7	Ind Arts	83.3	Engg Ind	73.6
Chem Abst	45.4	Ind Arts	37.5	Engg Ind	77.7	Ind Arts	55.3
Ind Arts	43.2	Engg Ind	37.5	Sci Ab B	38.8		
Sci Ab B	36.3	Brit Abst	25.0				
Engg Ind	20.4						
Sci Ab A	15.9						

(2) By each service's unique references as a per cent of the total bibliography:

Ind Arts	15.9	Chem Abst	31.2	Ind Arts	22.2	Engg Ind	44.7
Nuclear Sci	11.3	Brit Abst	12.5	Engg Ind	16.6	Ind Arts	26.3
Chem Abst	9.1	Engg Ind	12.5	Sci Ab B	0		
Engg Ind	2.3	Ind Arts	6.2				
Sci Ab B	2.1						
Sci Ab A	0						

(3) By each service's foreign references as a per cent of the total references in each bibliography:

Nuclear Sci	72.2	Chem Abst	80.0	Engg Ind	80.0	Engg Ind	92.3
Chem Abst	61.6	Brit Abst	40.0	Ind Arts	40.0	Ind Arts	7.7
Sci Ab B	38.8	Engg Ind	40.0	Sci Ab B	20.0		
Engg Ind	11.1	Ind Arts	20.0				
Ind Arts	5.5						
Sci Ab A	5.5						

(4) By the thoroughness of the coverage of the journals usually indexed (numbers indicate references missed or not missed):

Ind Arts	6	Ind Arts	0	Ind Arts	0	Ind Arts	0
Nuclear Sci	15	Chem Abst	3	Engg Ind	4	Engg Ind	10
Sci Ab B	21	Brit Abst	3	Sci Ab B	7		
Chdm Abst	22	Engg Ind	3				
Engg Ind	27						
Sci Ab A	31						

(5) By the completeness of the coverage of the journals in the field (numbers indicate references missed in journals not usually indexed):

Chem Abst	2	Chem Abst	2	Engg Ind	0	Engg Ind	0
Nuclear Sci	4	Engg Ind	7	Ind Arts	3	Ind Arts	17
Sci Ab A	6	Brit Abst	9	Sci Ab B	4		
Sci Ab B	7	Ind Arts	10				
Engg Ind	8						
Ind Arts	19						

(6) By promptness of getting references indexed or abstracted (numbers indicate time lag in months between article and index dates):

Ind Arts	1.8	Ind Arts	1.1	Ind Arts	1.1	Ind Arts	1.8
Nuclear Sci	3.9	Engg Ind	3.1	Engg Ind	1.9	Engg Ind	5.7
Engg Ind	4.4	Chem Abst	7.8	Sci Ab B	5.3		
Sci Ab B	5.9	Brit Abst	19.5				
Chem Abst	6.5						
Sci Ab A	7.0						

FIGURE II

Composite rank-order list of index and abstract services for each bibliography determined by relative positions in the other six lists (numbers indicate composites of ranks in other six lists):

Bibliography A (Electron Accelerators: Physics)		Bibliography B (Chlorine-Dioxide and Ozone Usage in Water Treatment: Civil and Chem. Engg. and Chem.)		Bibliography C (Telemetering: Elec. Engg.)		Bibliography D (Supersonic Aerodynamics: Mech. Engg.)	
Nuclear Sci	10	Chem Abst	9	Ind Arts	8	Engg Ind	8
Chem Abst	17	Engg Ind	12	Engg Ind	10	Ind Arts	10
Ind Arts	17	Ind Arts	14	Sci Ab B	18		
Sci Ab B	23	Brit Abst	16				
Engg Ind	26						
Sci Ab B	33						

worthy in view of the importance of the literature of physics to the chemist, and of chemical literature to the physicist.<sup>1</sup> *Chemical Abstracts* was found to be most nearly complete in coverage of the field, and second only to *Nuclear Science Abstracts* in per cent of total and foreign references.

A survey (touching in part on some of the topics covered in this study) of abstracting services has been in progress under the direction of the American Institute of Physics since October, 1948.<sup>2</sup> A preliminary report was made by Verner W. Clapp, chief assistant librarian of Congress, in a paper presented before the Serials Round Table at the 1950 Midwinter Meeting of

the American Library Association in Chicago. Clapp reported that the survey showed that 47 per cent of physics references were caught by *Chemical Abstracts* and that the average time lag between the dates of the original article and the abstract or index reference is either about four or four months or more than a year. Comparable results were indicated in this study.

Unesco, Aslib, The Royal Society of London, and many other organizations are devoting more and more time and publication space to this very pressing problem of documentation of research, so there should be a number of valuable reports in forthcoming library literature. And each library can, in its own way and for its own special purposes, add its own bit to the general knowledge of this rapidly-growing field of investigation.

<sup>1</sup> Fussler, Herman. "Characteristics of the Research Literature Used by Chemists and Physicists in the United States." *Library Quarterly*, 19:19-35, January 1949, and 19:110-43, April 1949.

<sup>2</sup> Bray, Robert S. "The Physics Abstracting Study of the American Institute of Physics." *Special Libraries*, Vol. 40, No. 7, p. 248-50, September 1949.

## Library of Congress Sesquicentennial

The 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Library of Congress on Apr. 24, 1800, will be commemorated with a Sesquicentennial Exhibition which opened with a reception on Monday, April 24, in the Great Hall of the Library. Many prominent librarians, government officials, members of Congress, educators and members of learned societies attended. The Exhibition, to be shown on the Ground Floor Gallery until December 31, will portray the progress of the Library during the last century and a half through changing displays of manuscripts, books, and photographs of the Library's collections.

By RUTHERFORD D. ROGERS

# Subject Bibliography Versus Subject Catalog and Periodical Index<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Rogers is librarian, *The Grosvenor Library*.

IT is not too generally recognized that subject bibliography is useful to a research worker approximately in inverse proportion to his ability. Inexperienced librarians and research students least informed about subject bibliography need it most, but they turn to more obvious bibliographical tools such as the subject card catalog and general periodical indexes. Therefore, I have undertaken to demonstrate, to a certain extent statistically, what good subject bibliography can do which the card catalog and periodical indexes fail to do. This paper is based on an analysis of book and periodical citations in approximately 26 bibliographies from four recognized sources: *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, *Dictionary of American Biography*, *Literary History of the United States* (cited as Spiller),<sup>2</sup> and Ebisch and Schücking, *A Shakespeare Bibliography*.<sup>3</sup>

## Methodology

Each book was checked in the Library of Congress printed catalog and in the catalog of the Grosvenor Library to determine the adequacy of the subject headings used in the card catalog. Those books which could

not be located in either of the two catalogs were eliminated from the statistical results. All books were divided into three categories: A, B, and C, examples and definitions of which are given in the following sections.

## CATEGORY A

Category A includes those books which could be found through the subject catalog as easily as through subject bibliography because the subject headings used were reasonably related to the subject under consideration. Hardly anyone would disagree that a person working on Shakespeare would look under such obviously related subjects as ENGLISH LITERATURE, ENGLISH DRAMA, etc. However, there is one reservation with respect to Category A: The card catalog lacks critical notes frequently contained in subject bibliography. For example, Spiller refers to a biography of Charles Brockden Brown by William Dunlap in these words: "The work is in fact extremely inaccurate but it has usually been followed by later writers." The *Dictionary of American Biography* article on Andrew Johnson, written by St. George L. Sioussat, refers to the literature on the reconstruction period in American History in these words: Hugh McCullough, *Men and Measures of a Half a Century* (1888) was one of the first important works, by a contemporary of real significance, to give a favorable estimate of Johnson's presidency, which up to that time had been described for the most part by enemies. W. A. Dunning, *Essays on the Civil*

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at meeting of Bibliography Committee, A.C.R.L., Chicago, Jan. 26, 1950.

<sup>2</sup> Edited by Robert E. Spiller [and others]. New York, Macmillan, 1948.

<sup>3</sup> Ebisch, Walter, Schücking, Levin L., Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1931. (Editor's Note: See article by Wesley Simonton in this issue of *College and Research Libraries*, which also considers this bibliography.)

*War and Reconstruction* (1898) as the first examination of the reconstruction policies with the detached view of historical scholarship exerted a determining influence on later writers. Influenced by Dunning is C. E. Chadsey, *The Struggle between President Johnson and Congress over Reconstruction* (1896). C. H. McCarthy, *Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction* (1901); J. W. Fertig, *Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee* (1898); and J. R. Neal, *Disunion and Restoration in Tennessee* (1899), belong to the same period of writing.

#### CATEGORY B

Category B includes those books which might be found by a highly skilled and persistent research worker through the subject catalog, but there is considerable question if an inexperienced research worker could thus locate the books. For example the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* cites Edward Westermarck's *The History of Human Marriage* in its bibliography under "Prostitution." I think the inexperienced research worker—and I mean inexperienced bibliographically speaking—could be excused for not looking in a book on marriage for information on prostitution. Unfortunately the subject catalog will not help him in this connection.

As a second example of this category, the *Dictionary of American Biography* states that there are two good descriptions of Joseph Dennie. Dennie was a minor American literary figure who lived at the end of the eighteenth and in the early nineteenth centuries. He was born and reared in Boston and was graduated from Harvard. He spent the most productive part of his life in New Hampshire and Philadelphia as an editor, literary agent and newspaper writer. The *Dictionary of American Biography* states that one of the two good descriptions of Dennie is in Washington Irving's *Salmagundi*, No. 8. Irving patterned Launcelot Langstaff after Dennie, but of course the card catalog does not provide information of this type.

It seems to me that three things are true about Category B:

1. The highly skilled, intuitive, persistent research worker might find books of the type cited.
2. The books could be found much more quickly through subject bibliography.
3. As literature grows in all subject fields it will be necessary to rely less and less on the sheer tenacity of the scholar to wade through the literature of his immediate as well as collateral fields and to rely more and more on good subject bibliography to discipline such literature.

#### CATEGORY C

Category C includes those books which could not have been found through the subject catalog because of the absence of an adequate or related subject approach. In the section "Sources, Literary Influences and Cultural Relations," *A Shakespeare Bibliography*<sup>4</sup> cites an edition of Montaigne's *Essays*<sup>5</sup> with an introduction by George Saintsbury which discusses the influence of Montaigne on Elizabethan drama and Shakespeare. Despite the importance of the author of the introduction, the card catalog gives no subject approach to the essay. Ebisch and Schücking (p. 67) cite a similar example, of an edition of *Seneca* with an introduction by T. S. Eliot.<sup>6</sup> This introduction likewise discusses the influence of Seneca on Elizabethan drama, but there is no subject approach to the essay in the card catalog. There is a third, somewhat different example in a book entitled *Biographic Clinics* by George M. Gould. One section of this six-volume work discusses the effect of Lafcadio Hearn's physical maladies and poor eyesight on his work. There is no approach to this information in the card catalog, either under HEARN, AMERICAN LITERATURE or any generally related subject.

<sup>4</sup> Ebisch and Schücking, p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> *The Essays*, done into English by John Florio. London, D. Nutt, 1892.

<sup>6</sup> *Seneca, His Tenne Tragedies*. London, Constable & Co., 1927. 2 vols.

## Methodology with Respect to Periodicals

Three categories, A, B, and C were also assigned to periodical articles. However, the periodical articles cited in the various bibliographies analyzed were not checked against the card catalog but against general periodical indexes. Two criteria were established to assist in the allocations:

1. Was the article in a magazine indexed by a general periodical index?
2. If so, did the general periodical index give adequate subject coverage to the article?

Spiller cites three periodical articles on Joseph Dennie. One is in a nineteenth-century periodical not indexed by a general periodical index. The other two are in periodicals indexed by general periodical indexes, but because the articles are primarily on other literary figures no reference is made to Dennie in the indexes.<sup>7</sup> The remoteness of the Wordsworth article can be appreciated when one realizes that the *Dictionary of American Biography* in its article on Dennie does not mention Wordsworth.

## Statistical Results

The statistical results of this study are outlined briefly in the table entitled "Distribution of Bibliographical Citations by Three Categories."

Distribution of Bibliographical Citations by Three Categories\*

Source	No. of Bibliographies Analyzed	No. of Verifiable Books	Distribution of Books by Categories			Per Cent of Total Books in Categories B and C	No. of Verifiable Periodical Articles	Distribution of Periodical Articles By Categories			Per Cent of Total Articles in Categories B and C
			A	B	C			A	B	C	
Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences	6	81	52	24	5	36	4	3	0	1	25
Spiller	9	87	45	21	21	48	46	38	0	8	17
Ebisch and Schücking	1	20	4	8	8	80	11	6	1	4	45

\* For Explanation, see text.

## Conclusions

Despite its obvious limitations, certain tentative conclusions are warranted by this study:

1. The basic premise of this paper is confirmed beyond reasonable doubt. That is, subject bibliography has a great deal to offer the research worker in locating materials not otherwise available and in providing critical notes on the literature of a given field.

2. Many so-called standard bibliographies are out of date. The *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* is between 15 and 20 years old. The situation in the field of the social sciences generally and history in particular is bad. To cite an example from another field, the *Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus* is 18 months behind the current output of medical journals. In order to do an effective job in the Grosvenor Library Medical Department, we must do our own subject indexing. Conservatively estimated, this costs the library \$1000 per year, and this situation can undoubtedly be multiplied many times throughout the country. It seems to me that we have an important professional

<sup>7</sup> Leary, Lewis. "Leigh Hunt in Philadelphia . . ." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 70: 270-280, 1946; and Leary, Lewis. "Wordsworth in America: Addenda," *Modern Language Quarterly*, 58: 391-393, 1943.

responsibility to secure the publication of new subject bibliographies and to assure the adequacy and timeliness of established subject bibliographies.

3. There is no substitute for good subject bibliography. It appears conservative to state that from 8 to 20 per cent of the material on a given subject can be found through good subject bibliography, if available, which cannot be found through the subject catalog and general periodical indexes. In certain subjects, an additional 15 to 60 per cent of the material may be found through subject bibliography but not through the other two more general bibliographical tools.

4. Good subject bibliography covering all fields of knowledge could replace the subject catalog. This is not a new idea, but I would like to add a note of caution in regard to it, particularly for the benefit of catalogers who become dejected when they read statements of this kind and immediately want to be transferred to a public service department. It will be years before we overcome the problems obstructing the production of inclusive and adequate subject bibliography.

5. Other things being equal, the more specific the subject coverage of a bibliography the more useful it is. This is apparent in *A Shakespeare Bibliography* which is divided into very narrow categories. A research worker bringing a problem to a bibliography of this type is much more likely to find assistance than in a bibliography divided into general subdivisions. However, there is a significant corollary to this conclusion. As bibliography becomes more and more specific, the effort required to create it and the magnitude of the final bibliography become greater and greater. In other words, if a bibliography on Shakespeare is divided into six subheadings, no book will be cited more than six times in the bibliography; but

if it is divided into 100 subheadings, it is quite possible for a general book to be cited 40 or 50 times. Those people who are planning bibliography at the national and international level must not consider the problems confronting them insuperable. If we add these additional quantitative and qualitative elements, we do so at the expense of becoming unrealistic. On the other hand, there is little point of producing inclusive national or international bibliography unless it is of such nature as to be useful in the ways outlined in this paper.

6. No cataloger or periodical indexer who must cover a general field or fields can compete with the scholar who is producing subject bibliography. First, the scholar has the advantage in knowledge of his area of interest. Second, and more important, the subject bibliographer is working on entirely different principles from the subject cataloger and the periodical indexer. The bibliographer is interested in a limited field. He reads widely in a general field and in collateral fields; selects a part of a book which, to the subject cataloger, seems unworthy of emphasis; analyzes minute parts of periodical articles in the same way; and brings all of these materials together into subject bibliography giving it tremendous statistical advantages.

The cataloger works on obviously different principles. For example, Vannevar Bush's *Modern Arms and Free Man* is an outstanding book of the year, an outstanding book on the subject, and written by perhaps the greatest living authority in the field. The subject catalog lists this book under two subjects, WAR and MUNITIONS, despite the fact that the following subjects are discussed at length: RELIGION AND SCIENCE; COMMUNISM; DEMOCRACY; TOTALITARIANISM; WORLD WAR, 1939-46—GER-

(Continued on page 227)

## Duplication of Subject Entries in the Catalog of a University Library and Bibliographies in English Literature

*Mr. Simonton is chief of the catalog department, University of Minnesota Library.*

### *The Clientele of the University Library*

DURING the period of the development of the dictionary card catalog in American libraries, a number of theories have been advanced as to the services which it can render effectively, and as to the proper methods of implementing those services. In some cases these theories have not been consistent with the demands which are made on the catalog by the public, for whom it is theoretically constructed. In earlier years librarians were too busy discovering the many possibilities inherent in the dictionary card arrangement itself to give serious thought to the value of the various services made possible by that arrangement. Recent years, however, have seen the beginning of systematic attempts to measure the actual uses made of the catalog.

The present study represents an examination of one of the services provided by most large college and university libraries (for practical purposes, the term may be broadened to include most of those libraries described as "research libraries"), namely, the inclusion in the card catalog of a complete file of all the works held by the library on any given subject. However, before examining this service, the different types of users of these libraries should be defined. They may be divided into two broad groups, hereafter designated in this study as "re-

search worker" and "general reader." By the former is meant those persons interested in an exhaustive study of a given subject, including faculty members, graduate students and visiting scholars. The term "general reader" includes both the undergraduate students of the liberal arts college which is part of the university, and also the research worker who is seeking information on a subject outside his sphere of major interest. The undergraduate student usually desires to have the entire literature of his subject made available to him; the research worker either consults "reserve" material containing assigned readings or calls for books of an introductory nature on a subject of interest.

The research worker's needs require the university librarian to develop the library's resources in certain fields of specialization as thoroughly as possible—by acquisition, interlibrary loan, and photographic duplication. Further, the library must provide the bibliographical apparatus required for intensive study of a subject. As the university library grows in size, however, it becomes increasingly necessary to make provision for special services to the general reader which are not found necessary in the smaller college library. In a large university library the general reader is often at a loss in choosing a book because of the abundance of material available, much of which is too specialized to satisfy his needs. Some of the larger libraries have sought to solve this

problem by establishing separate "undergraduate" or "college" libraries, with the book stock limited to carefully chosen general and introductory works on all subjects.

### *The Nature of the Subject Catalog*

In considering the question of the nature of the subject catalog, the demands made on it by the users of the library should be kept in mind. It has been pointed out that the research worker should possess an exhaustive knowledge of the literature of his field of interest. Either he already has that knowledge or he is interested in acquiring it. In the former case, he has no need of a subject index of any sort (except to keep abreast of current material); in the latter, he wants to know about everything written on the subject. In this case also, the subject catalog is of little use to him because it is limited to the material available in one library and because, in general, it catalogs by form and not by content. To learn everything written on a particular subject, the research worker must search every available bibliography and the subject catalog represents only an intermediate step. Until libraries find some solution along the lines of Fremont Rider's microcard, the needs of the research worker will remain unsatisfied. Furthermore, not only does the bibliography recognize no limitations of location or form of material, but it is more aware of the method of the research worker than the catalog can hope to be, at least in its present form. Swank's study<sup>1</sup> has shown that the doctoral student in English literature finds his research directed more effectively by the bibliography than by the library subject catalog and classification scheme, even for materials contained in the library, simply because the bibliographer takes the

reader's point of view and the cataloger does not.

On the other hand, the question of service to be provided to the general reader poses a problem which is the exact opposite to that raised by the needs of the research worker. The general reader wants only a few well-chosen general works on any given subject; if an undergraduate library exists and if it includes a good subject catalog, it will meet most of his needs. If, however, the general reader must use the same catalog as the research worker, the situation is very different. Present-day university library subject catalogs are generally produced to meet what are assumed to be the needs of the research worker, but as a matter of fact, the available evidence suggests that the subject catalog is used far more frequently by the undergraduate than by the graduate student or faculty member. Miller's study of the use of the card catalog at three university libraries<sup>2</sup> indicated that the graduate student and faculty member used the catalog twice as often for locating a particular book as for choosing a book on a given subject, whereas the ratio of use by the undergraduate student was virtually one to one. As a result, he recommended development of the subject catalog to meet undergraduate needs and vocabulary. Brown's investigation of the use of the subject catalog by graduate students in sociology at the University of Chicago<sup>3</sup> found that they used it only as a "supplementary tool" to professors' suggested reading lists or to bibliographies contained in journals or books. A recent report by Nyholm on the reaction to the change from dictionary catalog to divided catalog at the University of California<sup>4</sup> showed that the faculty ap-

<sup>1</sup> Swank, Raynard C. *The Organization of Library Materials for Research in English Literature*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1944. A summary of this study appeared in *Library Quarterly* 15:49-74, January 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Miller, Robert A. "On the Use of the Card Catalog." *Library Quarterly*, 12:629-37, July 1942.

<sup>3</sup> Brown, Margaret C. "The Graduate Student's Use of the Subject Catalog." *College and Research Libraries* 8:203-08, July 1947.

<sup>4</sup> Nyholm, Amy Wood. "California Examines Its Divided Catalog." *College and Research Libraries* 9:195-201, July 1948.

proved of the change because it separated the author entries, which they used almost exclusively, from the little-used subject entries. The students also liked the division because it made the subject entries more directly available than before. In many instances they had not even been aware of their existence. However they still found the subject catalog difficult to use because of the great number of entries under many headings.

#### *Coordination of the Subject Catalog with Existing Subject Bibliographies*

The evidence of these studies suggests that the subject catalog of the large university library, which attempts to provide a subject approach to every separately issued work contained in the library, often fails to serve either the research worker or the general reader effectively. This failure will occur most frequently in the case of broad subject headings, such as "English literature," "Economics," and "Political science." If it is assumed that large accumulations of cards under such headings are of limited use to the research worker because they do not constitute a complete bibliography of the subject, and are of little use to the general reader because their great number renders effective selection of desired material difficult, the necessity of their inclusion in the catalog may be questioned. Elimination of unnecessary subject cards would result in reducing the present size of the catalog, thereby minimizing present difficulties of physical arrangement. Further, in the future the making of subject entries as material is acquired may be reduced, thereby effecting economies in the number of cards to be made and filed.

Two of the most common objections to eliminating subject cards from the catalog have been (1) that the catalog should con-

tain a record of all the material in the library on a given subject, and (2) that the catalog should bring together material scattered through many bibliographies and material not available in any bibliography, due either to its rarity or to its recency. As a result, the catalog helps to identify items inadequately cited, which may be checked under subjects as well as under author. These two theories have been propounded most frequently by reference librarians, and it is doubtless true that their arguments are based on extensive use of the catalog in this way. However, as has been pointed out, it is impossible for the catalog to contain a complete record of all the resources of the library on a given subject unless the library is willing to resort to detailed analysis of periodicals, series, reports and other similar publications. It was the purpose of the present study to secure a partial answer to the second of these arguments. If it can be shown that in certain subject fields the subject catalog represents in large measure duplication of bibliographies already in existence, the second argument will lose much of its validity as far as those subject fields are concerned. To date, only two systematic studies of this sort of duplication have been made.

The first of these<sup>5</sup> determined the relative efficiency of the card catalogs of several large college and university libraries and of government indexes in making available the contents of federal documents, and found that use of the catalog had to be supplemented by use of the indexes if a significant number of the important works was to be found. The second study, Schloeder's "Selective Subject Cataloging,"<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Campbell, Grace A. "A Study of the Extent to which Existing Printed Government Indexes and Catalogues Can Replace the Card Catalogue in Making the Contents of Federal Documents Available." *Bulletin of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Library Bulletin No. 7*, vol. 36, no. 17, November 1939.

<sup>6</sup> Schloeder, Elmer. "Selective Subject Cataloging: A Preliminary Analysis of a Possible Means of Reduc-

found that 73.2 per cent of the titles listed under certain medical subject headings in the dictionary catalog of the Chicago University Libraries were also listed in the *Index-Catalogue of the Surgeon General's Office* (another 13.6 per cent being of too recent a date to permit inclusion in the bibliography).

### *Scope and Method of the Present Study*

The present study was undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining similar information in the field of English literature. Two subdivisions of this field were chosen for study, namely, the Shakespeare literature and the Chaucer literature. The catalog chosen for study was the main, or "general," catalog of the Columbia University Libraries. This is a union catalog of all the holdings of the libraries in the Columbia system, with the exception of those of the Teachers' College Library and apportion of those in the Law Library. As such, it includes main entries for all materials in all libraries, main and departmental, and omits secondary entries for works on specialized legal and medical subjects only. As of July 1, 1947, the total number of volumes in the Columbia University Libraries was 1,806,375;<sup>7</sup> at that time the catalog consisted of 2660 trays, containing approximately 2,660,000 cards (figured on the basis of 1000 cards per tray). For nearly 25 years it has been the policy of the library to assign subject headings to every item cataloged as a separate, regardless of size or format. Analytics have been made very sparingly. Prior to 1920 it was the practice to bind several pamphlets or other minor works in one volume, giving main entries for each item, but only one subject entry for the volume as a whole. In later

years many of these pieces have been recataloged so as to provide subject entries for each individual item.

In investigating the material on Shakespeare found in the Columbia catalog, the following three broad subject headings<sup>8</sup> were chosen for study as being headings likely to be consulted by the reader: SHAKESPEARE (not subdivided); SHAKESPEARE—BIOGRAPHY; SHAKESPEARE—CRITICISM AND INTERPRETATION.

Under these headings and under the heading investigated later (CHAUCER), Columbia has included entries for all materials cataloged separately, regardless of type of material or location in the library system. The only exception for the material under Shakespeare is a single entry for three "pamphlet volumes," which include a total of 16 titles. For purposes of this study, it was decided to treat these works as if they had been given separate subject entries, in view of Columbia's present policy, as outlined above. Hitchcock's study<sup>9</sup> found 14 types of material for which over 50 per cent of the libraries questioned agreed in omitting subject entries. Of these only two are applicable to the subject under study here: pamphlet collections and dissertation collections. The findings of this study of the Columbia catalog may, therefore, be applied by other libraries in the light of their method of handling these types of materials, as compared to the Columbia policy of including subject entries for them.

### *Quantitative Findings*

All titles listed under the three subject headings indicated above were searched in

<sup>7</sup> Throughout this study capital letters are used to indicate the catalog's subject headings, as opposed to the use of quotation marks to indicate those of the bibliographies; in both cases, dashes are used to indicate subdivision of heading.

<sup>8</sup> Hitchcock, Jennette, "The Coverage of Material under the Subject Entries of the Dictionary Catalog in American University Libraries." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1938. A summary of this study appeared in the *Library Quarterly* 10:59-94, January 1940.

ing the Bulk of the Catalog in the University Library." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1945.

<sup>9</sup> Cf., Annual Report, 1946-47, of Altha E. Terry, catalog librarian, Columbia University Libraries.

the following bibliographies to determine their availability to a reader interested in a comprehensive listing of works on Shakespeare: Ebisch and Schucking's *A Shakespeare Bibliography* (1931 and supplement 1935), the Shakespeare Association of America's *Annual Bibliography of Shakespeareana, 1925-1945*, Jaggard's *Shakespeare Bibliography* (1911), and the bibliographies included in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 1865-1940*. (These bibliographies are hereafter referred to as "Ebisch," "S.A.A.," "Jaggard," and "S.J.," respectively.) The bibliographies were checked in the order listed above, which seemed the one most likely to result in an effective search of the Shakespeare literature as of 1947, because of the limitations of the various bibliographies. Items found in any one bibliography were not searched in those checked subsequently, since it was considered that any comparison of the bibliographies themselves was extraneous to and beyond the scope of the present study. Of 502 titles listed in the Columbia catalog, 457, or 91 per cent, were found to be listed in the bibliographies—242 in Ebisch, 58 in S.A.A., 84 in Jaggard, and 73 in S.J.

The second heading chosen for study was selected because of the existence of a much more comprehensive single-volume bibliography than is the case for Shakespeare. Hammond's bibliography of Chaucer, together with its two supplements by Griffith and Martin, supplies a comprehensive listing of the material in this field published through 1933. In an attempt to bring the bibliography up to date, titles not found in these three works were checked in Wells' bibliography of writings in Middle English. The procedure outline above for analyzing the materials relating to Shakespeare was followed for comparing the duplication in Chaucer titles between the Columbia catalog and the bibliographies. Of 142 titles

listed in the Columbia catalog, 133, or 94 per cent, were found to be listed in the bibliographies—123 in Hammond, Griffith and Martin, and 10 in Wells. Three of the bibliographies used in this study—S.A.A., S.J., and Wells—are admittedly periodical publications and thus do not present the material included in as convenient a form as does the catalog. However, the question involved in this study is not one of convenience per se. The catalog is obviously easier to use for those titles to which subject headings have been assigned. In this connection, the possibility of use of the shelflist as a classified catalog which duplicates to a certain extent the work of the subject catalog should also be kept in mind. The question is rather, how much material does the subject catalog locate which the bibliographies do not also make available, in light of the assumption that the research worker must always consult the bibliographies for a complete listing of material of interest?

#### *Qualitative Findings*

At this point it is appropriate to consider the qualitative value of the bibliographies. Of the several works examined, only two, S.J. and Wells, represent less detailed subject cataloging than the Columbia catalog. Both employ only a single heading for the material on Shakespeare and Chaucer, respectively. The subdivisions of the other bibliographies are basically similar to those of the catalog. Jaggard and S.A.A. are directly comparable to the catalog in that many subdivisions are used and they are arranged alphabetically. However Ebisch, Hammond, Griffith and Martin, while including even more subdivisions than the catalog, employ a classified arrangement which brings together material under major headings.

The 242 titles common to the catalog and to Ebisch were checked in the latter by

major subdivision in order to compare the subject cataloging of the two tools and to ascertain the number of titles made available under each subdivision. This comparison of the qualitative value of the Columbia catalog and of Ebisch indicated two things. First, and more important, under each of the broad subjects chosen for study, the single bibliography listed a number of titles which should be sufficient for the general reader. For example, under the subdivisions "Shakespeare's life" and "Shakespeare's personality," a total of 69 titles was listed, including 27 under "The most important biographies (including general studies of Shakespeare's life and works)." This may be compared with the catalog's heading SHAKESPEARE—BIOGRAPHY, under which 52 titles were entered. In this connection it should be remembered that the bibliography is consciously selective as compared with the catalog, resulting in a list of titles more likely to be of value to the general reader.

Second, it was found that the heading used in the bibliography was in virtually every case more specific or more indicative of the book's actual contents than that of the catalog. Thus, of the 242 titles, 70 were listed under equivalent headings in the catalog and in the bibliography. Another 139 titles were listed in the catalog under SHAKESPEARE. Since the bibliography contains no such broad heading as this, all of these titles were listed under a more specific heading. The remaining 33 books, listed under different headings in the catalog and in the bibliography, were examined individually (by reading the preface to discover the author's purpose and by scanning the contents) to ascertain which tool provided a better subject heading. The bibliography proved better in 30 cases, leaving only three titles out of 242 in which the catalog heading was better than that of the bibliography.

### *Conclusions and Recommendations*

This study indicates that the practice of assigning subject headings to all items cataloged as separates in the Columbia University Libraries has resulted in files of titles under certain broad Chaucer and Shakespeare headings which represent almost complete quantitative duplication of the entries in certain basic bibliographies on the same subjects. Further, the subject cataloging of the bibliographies is more specific than that of the catalog for titles common to both.

The implication of these findings in regard to the use of the subject catalog by the research worker and by the general reader are plain. For the research worker the catalog lists only a handful of titles not available in the bibliographies, with which he is presumably already familiar, due primarily to two considerations: few analytics and only those titles held by a single library are included. For him the catalog would provide better service if it listed only those titles not already available in the bibliographies. He could thereby ascertain directly the titles held by the library with which he is likely to be unacquainted. For the general reader, the catalog lists too many titles for effective selection of the book to satisfy his particular needs. With the exception of the most recent titles, the bibliographies provide better guidance since those of first importance (Ebisch for Shakespeare and Hammond and Martin for Chaucer) provide annotations to guide him in his choice of an individual title.

In the light of these findings, certain recommendations may be made concerning the library's policy of including subject entries in the catalog for works which are already available through bibliographies. If it is assumed that a smaller catalog is desirable, the library can achieve this end in one of two ways. The first method would

be to eliminate all entries for titles listed in the bibliographies, making a general reference to these works under the subject heading in question. This would involve a purely mechanical operation and would leave in the catalog only a few older titles and all of those titles published after the effective date of the latest bibliography. It would seem to be an effective method of serving the needs of the research worker, but it would only partially satisfy those of the general reader.

In order to fulfil its obligations to the general reader, the catalog should include a certain basic number of titles of first importance, not limited by date of publication. The selection of these titles may be made either by specialists on the library staff, the faculty, or by cooperation between these two groups. The bibliography might well furnish a starting point for selection of those older titles which are still of first importance. As more recent titles are acquired by the library, they would be examined to determine their qualifications for inclusion in this group. The subject file would be broken into two parts and an introductory guide card placed at the beginning of the file reading:

For a comprehensive listing of material on this subject see the following bibliographies:

This catalog lists in File A a selected group of titles of first importance and in File B all titles held by the library which are not included in the bibliographies above.

This procedure would in some ways involve more work than the present policy of indiscriminate listing of all works on a given subject. Further, it would require some training of the catalog users by reference or cataloging assistants or, at least, a different

kind of training from that which they now receive. It should result in a more meaningful catalog, especially for the general reader, who, according to the available evidence, uses the subject catalog far more frequently than the research worker.

The extent to which the library may find it possible to reduce the size and increase the effectiveness of its subject catalog, will of course be limited by the number and nature of subject bibliographies available. This study has been concerned only with those bibliographies of value in certain areas of English literature. For any large-scale program it will be necessary to make similar investigations in other subject fields. The most efficient method of carrying out this work would seem to be through the establishment of something like the "bibliographical service department" proposed most recently by Swank,<sup>10</sup> a department which would be responsible for the correlation of the subject catalog and subject bibliographies.

The next stage is that of developing subject bibliographies in fields where they do not now exist. At present Harvard is planning to produce subject bibliographies based on its extensive holdings, to be used in place of the card catalog. Cooperation of other scholarly libraries in this project would result in bibliographies of first importance in many subject fields. Further, this project should be coordinated with Ellsworth's proposals concerning centralized cataloging for scholarly libraries,<sup>11</sup> which envision the creation of printed cumulative union author catalogs, including as a by-product printed subject bibliographies, both comprehensive and selective-annotated. Only by providing such services will the large university library meet the needs of its two types of users—the research worker and the general reader.

<sup>10</sup> Swank, *op. cit.*, p. 73-74.

<sup>11</sup> Ellsworth, Ralph E., "Centralized Cataloging for Scholarly Libraries," *Library Quarterly* 15:237-43, July 1945.

## Control of Subject Information: Can It Be Mechanized?

*Mr. Bristol is head of the Catalog Department, Peabody Institute Library, Baltimore.*

TO librarians the Industrial Revolution bears the aspect of a communicational revolution, which in the past century has produced an ever-swelling flood of informational materials, many in new media. Within the limits of printed matter the mass of information is so huge that it has been difficult even to inventory it. Nevertheless the inventory approach has resulted in the building up of trade bibliographies, printed library catalogs, and union catalogs, all of which arrange in convenient form and in relatively few alphabets millions of titles, mostly by author, and which among them come close to complete coverage. In this country a complete inventory, if not within reach, is at least within sight along the lines suggested by Ellsworth in 1948.<sup>1</sup>

The next logical step is to control the subject information in the inventory. Plainly this is vastly more difficult. For instance, serial publications can be inventoried fairly easily through union lists; but "the bibliography of serial contents is of a magnitude to dwarf the problem of monograph bibliography."<sup>2</sup> Moreover,

to subject bibliography . . . there is no definable end, no consistent national or annual

limitation, no reliable or even desirable uniformity of interpretation, and a great desire to reduce the mass selectively.<sup>3</sup>

The problem of recording this mass of subject information is an immense one. Yet it is at least equaled in difficulty by the problem of releasing recorded information swiftly and completely enough to satisfy modern research. In the humanities, it is true, scholars have long been accustomed to the leisurely pursuit of learning; nor is the mass of information, though rapidly spreading, bursting all bounds as is the literature of science. Scientific research cannot wait. In the field of chemistry, for instance, Jaffe<sup>4</sup> points out that developments which hitherto took decades now take only a few years, and that the rate of change is increasing. Scientists are confronted with a mass of observations, facts and ideas which they are not able to put to use.

What would satisfy the scientific researcher? Without regard for the means used to obtain it, he wants a *small* record, one which will not baffle him by its immensity or its complexity; he wants a *complete* record, one which has overlooked no pertinent information; he wants a *convenient* record, one which can be used wherever he chooses; and he wants a *quick* record, one which can be had in a matter of

<sup>1</sup> Ellsworth, R. E. "Centralized Cataloging in the Library of Congress." *Library of Congress Information Bulletin*, Nov. 16-22, 1948. Appendix.

<sup>2</sup> Williams, E. E., and Ruth V. Noble. "Subject Bibliography: Preliminary Memorandum." In *Conference on International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges*, Chicago, American Library Association, 1947, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Vanderbilt, Paul. "National Bibliography and Bibliographical Control." *College and Research Libraries*, 9:163, April 1948.

<sup>4</sup> Jaffe, F. "Quelques réflexions sur la division 66 et plus spécialement sur la subdivision 661 de la C. D. U. et sur son emploi pour la documentation de l'industrie chimique." In *Fédération internationale de documentation, 17th conference, Berne, 1947. Rapports 1*. La Haye, 1947. p. 59.

hours, not weeks.<sup>5</sup> His desires jibe perfectly with the aim of every reference librarian, which is surely this: the release of the maximum of accurate information with the minimum of time and effort.

Against this background classifications, subject catalogs, and indexing services—tools familiar to every librarian—though often excellent as finding devices, have grave defects both in recording and in releasing subject information. Critics of library classifications have concluded that too little information is released,<sup>6,7</sup> and that the effort expended in making the schemes work is far too great.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps catalogers and classifiers, by nature of the puzzle-solving type (else why do they become catalogers and classifiers?), have been so intent on fitting books into classification systems that they have lost sight of the fundamental question of the over-all effectiveness of their work. Certainly any classification scheme is gravely wanting if it is cumbersome to put information into it and to get information out of it, and if there is no assurance that more than a fraction of the information desired is obtainable by using it.

It is safe to say that subject headings, despite cogent criticism<sup>9</sup> of their unplanned growth and resulting heterogeneous form, do release more information than do classifications. But do they release enough? According to Pettee, the subject catalog is an instrument to serve as a popular guide to general informative reading and not to furnish the exhaustive bibliographies scholars need. . . . The scholar uses the subject catalog only incidentally for material outside his main theme or as a first step in assembling the multitude of

books through which he expects to search patiently.<sup>10</sup>

But scientific researchers are increasingly unwilling to undergo "patiently" the drudgery of literature searching. Not only are scientists impatient; they are humanly fallible as well. According to Ball, they simply cannot remember all the terms relating to a given area of scientific effort, or even of any one major science. Moreover, a system of complete cross-referencing among all related entries in a large index creates an unwieldy bulk and a sense of frustration in trying to follow a train of association.<sup>11</sup>

Researchers are demanding even more subject approaches. Eugene W. Scott, for example, states that some Research and Development Board technical papers may need from 100 to 1000 headings adequately to cover their potentialities. Standard library subject heading work is simply not equal to such a task. Present library practices are so laborious that much material is obsolete before it is usable; subject heading workers cannot know enough fields thoroughly; transactions, pamphlets and serials, which often contain the latest and best information, are usually not analyzed.

Subject work within libraries is even now, in fact, less important than subject work outside them; "the major problem of subject bibliography is the problem of indexing and abstracting serials."<sup>12</sup> Indexing services, under the auspices of private enterprise and of scientific societies, have made extensive inroads on the "bibliography of serial contents," but their coverage is slow, and incomplete in spite of their minuteness; according to Coblans,<sup>13</sup> only a third of the real

<sup>5</sup> Tauber, Mortimer. "Memorandum for a Conference on Bibliographical Control of Government Scientific and Technical Reports." *Special Libraries*, 39:160, May-June 1948.

<sup>6</sup> Kelley, Grace O. *The Classification of Books*. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1937, p.125.

<sup>7</sup> Tauber, M. F. "Reclassification and Recataloging in College and University Libraries: Reasons and Evaluation." *Library Quarterly*, 12:835, October 1942.

<sup>8</sup> Bush, Vannevar. "As We May Think." *Atlantic Monthly*, 170:106, July 1945.

<sup>9</sup> Prevost, Marie L. "An Approach to Theory and Method in General Subject Headings." *Library Quarterly*, 16:140-151, April 1946.

<sup>10</sup> Pettee, Julia. *Subject Headings; the History and Theory of the Alphabetical Subject Approach to Books*. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1947, p.63, 83.

<sup>11</sup> Ball, N. T. "Classification," p.6. Preliminary draft of unpublished chapter made available to the author, to be included in Perry and Casey, *Punched Card Systems*.

<sup>12</sup> Williams and Noble, *op. cit.*, p.17.

<sup>13</sup> Coblans, Herbert. "Organization of the Literature of Science." *South African Libraries*, 14:47, October 1946.

total of worth-while scientific papers gets indexed. Yet the bulk, because of the minuteness of what has been done, has prevented as much cumulation as is needed. Bibliographies, more useful to scholars than subject catalogs because they take the reader's point of view, go beyond the confines of a single library; but they too do not give complete coverage of the field, nor are they rapidly compiled.

Perhaps it would be possible to achieve control of subject information by coordinating all these tools, but successful coordination is certainly far off. Such coordination, even if theoretically possible, will never succeed until libraries cease to rely on handicraft tools and until they develop mechanical devices for the release of information which are in step with the communicational revolution which has caused their bibliographic woes.

For some 15 years sporadic experiments have been carried out on various mechanical devices—punched cards, magnetic tape, coded metal plates, and coded microfilm. Of these the most widely known are the two types of punched cards, edge-notched and over-all punched. In this country the principal supplier of edge-notched cards is the McBee-Keysort Company; the field of over-all punched cards is dominated by the International Business Machines Corporation.

Keysort cards, best known to librarians, operate on a simple principle. They vary in size, but all have rows of holes punched close to the card margins. When a card is coded, certain holes are converted into notches extending to the edge of the card. Sorting the file of cards is done by running a long needle through the proper hole; the notched cards fall out when the file is lifted on the needle.

Library uses of Keysort cards have been mostly confined to circulation control. Installations for control of subject information

have been made chiefly for individuals or for small special libraries, particularly in various enterprises where technical chemistry is involved. Information can easily be recorded on the cards; even abstracts can be typed on them or inserted in them in windows. The cards can also be searched easily, but not fast enough for large installations. They are not easily reproduced and do not supply a printed record. In short, edge-notched cards seem best adapted to fields in which there are a large number of simple, definite elements which relate to a comparatively small number of core ideas. It is unlikely that they will ever be useful in larger bibliographic installations than special libraries, and in those only if they do not use more than 10,000 cards in a single file.

Over-all punched cards, typified by I.B.M. cards, differ markedly from Keysort cards. In I.B.M. cards rectangular holes are punched by machine in certain fixed locations. "All the holes punched are identical in size and shape, but are given meaning by their location in any one of the possible 960 positions."<sup>14</sup> Sorting must also be done by machine. The newest I.B.M. machines sort cards at 650 a minute; 10,000 cards can be searched in 15 minutes.

For any type of installation, bibliographic or not, I.B.M. equipment, being much more complex than Keysort, requires careful adaptation to the job in hand; its costliness necessitates thorough advance planning; use must be fairly constant to justify the cost; unforeseen difficulties are likely to occur; but savings in money and time may be considerable. Two facts about punched cards are worth noting: (1) almost all library installations for any purpose whatever have been made within the last 20 years; and (2) extension of uses from one application to another has been cautious and has re-

<sup>14</sup> Peakes, G. L., "Report Indexing by Punched Cards," *Journal of Chemical Education*, 26:139, March 1949.

quired each library staff to adapt the machines to each new use.

Unlike Keysort cards, the theoretical coding capacity of I.B.M. cards is astronomical. Though the actual capacity is far less (because the cards are generally broken down into fields), it is still more than adequate to code any present or likely future list of headings. Moreover, the I.B.M. people are currently engaged on a development which will permit random punching anywhere on the surface of the card and thus immensely increase the coding capacity.

I.B.M. selecting equipment is several times faster than Keysort. Sorting 40,000 cards an hour sounds like a tremendous speed until one stops to think of library situations in which it might be necessary to search a million cards, which would take upwards of four seven-hour days. Large libraries, the ones most likely to use I.B.M. cards for the control of subject information, are thus faced with a dilemma. The larger they are, the more they need rapid searching. But the larger their collections, the longer would be the search required, and the more searches would be called for.

Can the information on I.B.M. cards be reproduced in usable form? What might be called "invisible" bibliographies, consisting of cards with holes in them, can be produced by reproduction of the cards themselves (at a distance if desired) by means of the card-operated tape punch, followed by the tape-controlled card punch. For reproduction of the actual information on the cards in printed, readable form the best means is the I.B.M. tabulator, which has enabled various agencies to carry out printing and publication successfully. The publication which comes nearest to the appearance of ordinary printing is the index to the *Bibliography of Agriculture*, which has been issued by means of the tabulator. Use of I.B.M. cards makes it possible for monthly indexes to be cumulated into an annual

issue, and for a subject index to be prepared.

The three requirements which any system of control of subject information must fulfil are these: adequate recording, swift and thorough searching, and reproducing in usable form. In selection speed, coding capacity, and release of information in printed form I.B.M. cards excel Keysort cards. But bins of I.B.M. cards take a great deal of space; the machines are complicated and costly to install and operate; and they are still not fast enough to perform the maximum job to be done.

In the literature on punched cards the dimensions of that job have not been clearly marked. Many writers assume that what is required is a search of the material available within a single specialized library. If this is all, either catalog cards or punched cards will do the job, the latter somewhat more speedily. As the information coded into the cards of a single library is limited, so is the information extracted.

Other writers, particularly in the field of science, tacitly assume that what is desired is a search of the total subject bibliography of a special field. Some writers seem to expect also the rapid production of printed, cumulative bibliographies. Such demands make Keysort cards and even I.B.M. cards appear slow and clumsy. Some swifter and more flexible tool is needed.

Such a tool is the Rapid Selector, now being developed at the Department of Agriculture Library. It is based on coded microfilm run at enormous speed past a camera which photographs all items having a given code designation and records them on film or sensitized paper. The machine was developed during the late 1930's at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and although it never operated successfully there, the principles on which it was constructed are basically those of the machine at the Department of Agriculture.

Each separate frame on the film is di-

vided into two sections by a line running lengthwise down the center of the film. The information section of each frame contains an abstract, a citation, a photograph, drawings or any other kind of information which can be filmed. Alongside the information section is a code section, which in an extremely small space permits a choice among an extremely large number (at present 10,000,000) of coding positions. As the film runs at high speed through the selector, it passes over a scanning plate set to match the code designation of the particular subject on which the operator wishes information. When the code patterns match exactly, a flash lamp is set off and the selected items are photographed on recording film. Either positives or negatives can be made. Negatives 5x8 inches in size are not entirely without blur, but are readable with little difficulty.

Currently the Rapid Selector scans over 75,000 subjects a minute. The mechanism which moves the recording film into position is not yet able to keep up with the passage of the information film across the scanning plate. Thus if similar subjects are extremely close together, the second may be missed by the recording film unless the projection machine is slowed down. When this technical difficulty is obviated, even higher speeds will be possible.

To date, development and research on the Rapid Selector at the Department of Agriculture has been entirely paid for by the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce. Moreover, the first 30,000 O.S.R.D. reports were run on the selector for purposes of experimentation. Except for the P.B. report<sup>18</sup> which was published by the Office of Technical Services in the summer of 1949, little publicity has

been given the research done, and comparatively few people have even seen the machine in operation. Those who have, agree as to its practicability.

The Rapid Selector is clearly superior to punched cards as a tool for the control of subject information. It can record a variety of materials on a single reel; it is highly economical of space; it handles materials thousands of times faster than punched cards; it gives the searcher his information in the form of a copy of the original. To scientific researchers it can supply bibliographies, with or without abstracts, almost instantaneously.

In short, the Rapid Selector is making so great a forward step in solving the problems of selection of information and of reproduction that the next step must be taken by those who insert material into the record. Since the selector is capable of searching an immense literature and sifting out complete information on a topic, it is now possible to consider whether total coverage shall be attempted. The development of selection by mechanical means does not solve that problem; but it does focus our attention on it more sharply.

Regardless of the degree of totality that may some day be achieved, it is plain that mechanized selection, especially by means of the Rapid Selector, will greatly affect the older bibliographic tools. Classification systems in libraries will become less and less important and will become useful chiefly as a means of assigning call numbers. As for catalogs, at a recent meeting of the Maryland-Virginia group of catalogers Shaw said of the Rapid Selector: "I am convinced it may eventually take the place of the conventional card catalog. I am also convinced it will never take the place of the cataloger." Whether or not the card catalog is doomed to ultimate extinction, it is certain that it will decline in importance; even subject catalogs will dwindle into finding lists, for which

<sup>18</sup> For a summary cf. "Rapid Selector is Newest Research Aid," *Library Journal*, 74:1119-1120, August 1949.

they are today used far more than is admitted. But subject cataloging, the most intellectually demanding of present-day cataloging techniques, will come into its own.

One of the most fertile fields for the new tools is the control of materials which have already been indexed and abstracted, rather than directly of subject content. For example, "it would take the Rapid Selector only about 15 minutes to review all the entries that have appeared in the last 30 years in *Chemical Abstracts*."<sup>16</sup> Hence indexes will continue to expand. And hence subject cataloging, in the sense of analysis of information, will require greater skill and higher standards of subject knowledge. Librarians who can qualify as subject special-

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1119.

ists will rise in esteem in the eyes of both their own and other professions.

It should be noted that it has been assumed that libraries and librarians will take the initiative in guiding the new bibliographic tools. But it is equally possible that just as indexes and bibliographies were given over to outside agencies, so the new devices will be grasped most eagerly by those who first realize their potentialities. If this comes to pass, if libraries do not seize the opportunity afforded by the new tools, it is all too probable that their research collections will be left to wither into innocuous desuetude while other agencies take over their research functions. Machines do not change human nature; but automotive transportation has certainly disposed of the horse and buggy.

## Subject Bibliography Versus Subject Catalog

(Continued from page 214)

MANY; EDUCATION; EVOLUTION; PHILOSOPHY; SCIENCE—STUDY AND TEACHING; MEDICINE—STUDY AND TEACHING; and U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

7. The time has passed when we need to debate the merits of good subject bibliography. The library profession wishes to assume some leadership in the production of

subject bibliography. However, we do not have an adequate number of capable people in our profession to provide the leadership let alone the army of trained scholars necessary to do the spade work. Perhaps the latter is not a function of our profession, but if we are to assert leadership we must either develop capable bibliographers in adequate numbers within our profession or import them into librarianship from other fields.

## Rare Books in the University Library

*Rare Books in the University Library*, published as Part II of the July 1949, issue of *College and Research Libraries*, and issued as a separate by A.C.R.L., received an impressive review in *The (London) Times Literary Supplement* for April 28, 1950. Copies of *Rare Books in the University Library* are still available at A.C.R.L. Headquarters, American Library Association, Chicago, Ill.

By CARL M. WHITE

## A New Mechanism in the Organization of Library Service in the Northeast<sup>1</sup>

*Dr. White is director of libraries and dean of the School of Library Service, Columbia University.*

MY UNDERSTANDING is that the purpose of this meeting is to see whether we cannot unite the results of two independent but overlapping series of conversations on library cooperation. In one series, the participants have been limited to librarians in New York City; in the other, to four large research institutions which later invited first three, then four, other similar institutions to join them. Today the basis of these conversations is still further broadened.

The two original groups have found the problem we are discussing at this meeting exceedingly complex. They have nevertheless made encouraging progress and have succeeded in making errors, if at all, in almost opposite directions. A man may perhaps be permitted to do some fumbling in trying to get his shoulder under a heavy load. By such fumbblings, we find we have been working our way around this sizable undertaking till we are now in sight of one another, one group narrowing its approach from a more general consideration of the various possibilities of library cooperation, the other broadening its approach from a consideration of the advantages to a small number of

the larger research libraries of off-campus low-cost storage for little-used books.

In recent weeks, every effort has been joined to close the gap between these two approaches, and it is with high expectations in this matter of resolving any remaining differences in viewpoint that we look forward to hearing the paper by Mr. Metcalf today. Our senior research library director in the Northeast, Mr. Metcalf, is undertaking the difficult task of outlining in concrete terms a proposal for action on which it is to be hoped we can all unite. Such an assignment, undertaken in behalf of the Northeast as a whole, makes it fitting for all of us to gather around and help as best we can, but I confess I was at first at a loss to know how I was supposed to do so when the invitation came to prepare what amounts to a separate paper on essentially the same topic. I gather, however, that those who planned the program wished something like a case history of group thinking on library cooperation. They reasoned, it appears, that a connected statement showing where the librarians of New York City have arrived and why and how they happened to arrive there would, in a small way, supplement a call to action by providing background—a partial rationale—for the idea of a northeastern regional library.

I shall be glad to do what I can with such an assignment, but I must point out at

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the College and University Library Section of the New York Library Association, April 29, 1950.

once that the views of New York City librarians have nowhere been formally defined. In fact their views are so plastic that any attempt at this stage to project them as fixed or final would not only be premature; it would tend to clamp a strait jacket on healthy growth. I must therefore limit myself to something like a biographical interpretation of the short life of this series of conversations. In so doing, I shall draw mostly on the work of a steering committee and two supporting committees, and for short I shall refer to them as the "N.Y. committees," or just "committees."

Before launching into this story I ought to acknowledge that we have been free borrowers. We have tried to keep in mind the experience embodied in other cooperative undertakings and so far as in us lay to penetrate the larger meaning or implications of certain recent developments—the emergence of bibliographical centers, for example, the creation of the New England Deposit Library and Midwest Inter-Library Center, the organization of Danish public libraries into a network through which each can tap the resources of others, the National Central Library in London, and so on. We are under no illusion about how rare indeed originality is except as it is either a new arrangement of other people's ideas or a creation called for so urgently by changed conditions that the solution is already, so to speak "in the air"—that is, half formed in the minds of various intelligent people who face essentially the same conditions.

One of our main conclusions can be stated in a single sentence. The N.Y. committees are of the opinion that the wisest course to be pursued in developing research library service in the northeastern United States is to establish a new type of regional library in either one of two forms: (1) a library serving primarily the research requirements of the 12 to 15 million people in the local met-

ropolitan district, or (2) a library serving the research requirements of the 38 or 39 million people in New England and the Middle Atlantic States. A comparison of these two regions shows that, whereas roughly half as many people live in the metropolitan district as live in the rest of the Northeast, the smaller region comprising a few counties in three states spreads over only about one-seventieth or one seventy-fifth of the land area embraced by the nine states in New England and the Middle Atlantic States. It must be clear to all, as it is to us, that there would be some advantages in using the smaller region, with its great population packed into a few political units, as a basis of planning the next step, even if that step be conceived as only the first one toward a regional library for the whole Northeast; but we see in the use of the larger region enough potential advantages to be willing to join the rest of you in exploring the opportunities and risks of using the larger region as a basis of planning from the start. One member of the N.Y. circle summed it up this way: There are enough resources outside the metropolitan district to build a regional library without our help, just as there are enough resources in the metropolitan district to build a regional library without help from the outside; but it would be a pity for us to proceed independently when both groups and the cause of serious intellectual inquiry they serve stand to profit so much by uniting their efforts and building a great regional library.

The suggestion of the larger region came out of the second Metcalf report to the Greater Four in January. It is one of two major contributions of his which have exerted considerable influence on our thinking, as you will see, the other being the idea of cooperative low-cost storage for little-used books. This January report, while described as a "proposal for a northeastern regional

library," still bore so strongly the stamp of storage-library thinking, of which the New England Deposit Library might serve as a general illustration, that it did not measure up to our conception of what a bona fide regional research library should be. This brings me to the main purpose of this paper which is an attempt to describe four paths of thought which converge on a conception of a regional library of broader dimensions than a regional storage library for sloughed off books.

One of these trails leads straight over the hill from where some companions nudged us into striking up these conversations. On Jan. 20, 1948, representatives of the governing boards of leading libraries and institutions of higher learning in New York City met for dinner on joint invitation from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller Foundation. The main topic discussed was library cooperation. This dinner was followed by another on February 12 for librarians from the same—or nearly the same—institutions and was devoted to the same topic. Out of these two meetings came an informal arrangement to stimulate discussion of the possibilities of library cooperation. Within two months from the second meeting, that machinery was working so well that we were beginning to feel like the little man in the cartoons who is always pictured with some planet-like burden which costs him untold toil and sweat and tears but never quite crushes the life out of him.

What was the motive? What was behind this ceremony of dropping that planet-like burden on us? A healthy appetite for good food and good conversation? Interesting, but hardly adequate. A gesture intended to invite new library projects which these two foundations might be afforded the opportunity to support? We are able to confide a reliable answer to this question. With flawless correctness, the foundations have man-

aged to convey to the little man their assurances of boundless sympathy and high esteem and the intelligence that he is unmistakably, absolutely on his own. The very plethora of library projects however, which find their way to the foundations each year—may this not be our clue? Picture yourself behind the Big Desk of Decision on which piles up, from all quarters of this continent and the globe, one request after another for funds for library purposes. What would you do? Would you not soon begin to ask yourself, where are all these well-worded proposals taking us? Do those who present them know, or are they improvising by gamely hacking away on small pieces of their problem, each on whatever piece the daily pressures have shoved closest to his heart? Is this enough? Is it enough to sit there and wait for librarians singly, or in organized groups, to develop their own proposals without relation to some large design, and whichever way you answer that question, whose job is it, theirs or yours to size up what all this energetic chopping away on big trees is doing to the bigger forest?

It takes a better man than I am to plumb the depths of that remarkable entity, the corporate mind of a large foundation, so I beg you to assume that any supposed correspondence between this analysis of why we first came together and the actual facts is purest fancy. But I can say with more authority that the circumstances under which our conversations began were such as to deflect our minds to some extent from the more pressing matters of immediate daily concern in our own libraries and to cause us to feel a somewhat larger measure of responsibility to assist the public in thinking about the survival and the good health of the research library as one of the cornerstones of our kind of society. If this seems a little remote from the daily preoccupations of ordinary librarians like ourselves, remember that that planet-like burden is not made any lighter to

anyone inside or outside foundations on that account.

Now we come to a path which is worn more plainly. The earliest method of providing physical connections on which telephonic communication depends was to use heavy steel wires and string them on poles above ground. It was a very practical method at first, but in time it ran the telephone business straight into a crisis. This is the way it happened. As more telephones were required, more crossbars were nailed to ever taller telephone poles. But the arithmetic limits of telephone poles were exceeded by the geometric growth in the popularity of telephones. By the time New York City had lined West Street with 90-foot poles, the tallest ever used, with each pole carrying 30 crossbars and each crossbar loaded to capacity with wires, it was not difficult to see that some kind of reorganization of the industry had to take place; otherwise the accepted standard of telephone service would be impaired. Happily, the crisis had been foreseen, and a dry core cable was developed which used thin copper wire, insulated with dry paper, hermetically sealed in a continuous lead sheath. By 1914, as many as 1200 tiny pairs of wires were being crammed into a single two and a half inch cable. That number of steel wires would have required eight giant poles the size of those used on West Street. Had the old method of stringing wires remained unchanged, and had the supply of tall poles held out, acres and acres of Manhattan's streets would today be required to provide the standard of service the telephone industry provides us.

The illustration may sharpen the point of what I think is the most important question I shall ask you. It is this. Do the practical realities faced by civilized man midway in the twentieth century in retaining control over the record of the mind call for the insertion of a new mechanism in the organiza-

tion of research library service?

All of you are as familiar as New York City librarians with the situation faced by the research library, and you are far more familiar with it than the public generally. But as those of you who have had anything to do with setting problems for research know, general familiarity with a problem and precise definition of that problem are two quite different things. Why is careful definition of a problem important? Partly because it invariably suggests, directly or indirectly, the method of attack to be used in solving it. That raises the question as to what it is we conceive the problem of the research library to be.

One statement of that problem runs this way: research libraries are just not getting the money they need to do the job expected of them. If this definition of the problem is to be accepted, the research library has its method of attack clearly laid out for it. It must stand its ground and gamely fight out its future on the issue of increased financial support. There are those among us who take this stand. They believe with deep sincerity that all the talk about library cooperation is beautiful but perhaps a little balmy, and that the individual library is not going to measure up to its responsibilities until it gets more money—a great deal more. It is just as simple as that.

Another way to state the problem is in terms of stabilizing the growth of library collections. Research libraries, it is pointed out, "tend to grow more rapidly than the other parts of the institutions to which they are attached. By the time they reach the size of the Harvard Library, they can no longer increase their annual expenditures as they have in the past without taking a larger percentage of the total resources, unless the University has a rapidly expanding economy. Sooner or later, we must face the fact that every time the library increases its budget more rapidly than other parts of the

university, the other parts must reduce their budgets to a corresponding extent.<sup>172</sup>

The central problem as thus conceived is one of so stabilizing the growth of research libraries that they can, like other units of a university, live on a more or less fixed budget. The line of attack thus suggested is threefold: let each library set restricted bounds to the areas it will itself undertake to cover, selectively and inclusively; farm out to other libraries on a cooperative basis the job of total coverage; and build a regional storage library to take care of the books these libraries find it necessary to slough off in order to stay within these self-imposed bounds.

Those who are present in this room need not be reminded that this formulation of the problem and this line of attack are the fruits of the best years of thought and experience of the most seasoned veteran among us. One does not lightly entertain doubt about the adequacy of a solution so highly accredited and advocated with such deep sincerity and so persuasively by one so warmly esteemed among us. But if I understand the mood of our common searchings we seek first of all the best solution, and not one of us would wish intentionally to pass over an earnest question which conceivably might help us make some slight improvement. Surely we must agree that adequacy of financial support is a key to the problem facing us—so much so that any attempt to freeze research library budgets under conditions as they exist, or which can now be foreseen, would I fear be ill advised. Surely, stabilizing research library growth within reasonable limits is a key to the problem too. But do these two keys, separately or in combination, turn all the cylinders in the lock; and if they fail to do so, can we improve in any way, even slightly, upon the way the problem can be most fruitfully conceived?

<sup>172</sup> Metcalf, Keyes D., "Harvard Faces Its Library Problems," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 3:193, 1949.

We may not be ready, any of us, to answer that question, but even though that be the case, it may not be a waste of time to raise the question so that each may use it to search carefully his own thinking.

The title of this paper, of course, suggests a third key which might have some use in combination with the two just mentioned—namely, that our fundamental problem is one of adequate organization of research library service—or if you prefer, one of partial reorganization aimed at retaining or regaining control of a situation which is gradually getting out of hand. It is not a question, of course, of the internal organization of individual libraries; at least that is not the main point. Neither is it a question of overextending tall telephone poles by organizational splices of a kind which the present setup is really not designed to support. It is more a question of changing the design of the setup to some extent, of changing slightly what might be called the institutional basis of research library service. Happily, no radical change is necessary, for at many points we are doing well already—quite well indeed. At other points, however, we are falling down, and the setup itself contributes to our failure in spite of our best efforts to the contrary. We seek, for example, to give society—the public in the broadest sense—the service we think it requires, and we find ourselves hampered by a setup so costly that society seems unable or unwilling to go on footing the bill. We seek to reduce those costs and find ourselves hampered by a setup which calls for unnecessary waste in duplication. We seek through united effort (the spirit of which in the Northeast is, I believe, unsurpassed) to reduce unnecessary duplication and find ourselves hampered by a setup which excites competition, rivalry, even dark jealousy. We seek to make each dollar count 100 cents worth toward achieving the objectives of the clientele our library is chartered to serve,

and lo, we find ourselves hampered by a setup which saddles on our consciences and our budgets the burden of taking part of that dollar and providing something over and above the felt needs of the local clientele—the burden namely of providing inclusive coverage “in the national interest.” Here we come around face to face once more with our broad social obligations—which is the point where we started around the circle.

Does conceiving the problem in terms of the over-all organization of research library service in the nation, and the Northeast in particular, help us any in thinking about a solution? I think it does.

It suggests that we should somehow find a way to transfer library cooperation, or at least certain emerging areas of library activity which have been going by that name—it suggests transferring these emerging areas of activity from the outside to the inside of the setup by a process of institutionalizing cooperative library activity. It does not matter much what we call the institution which results from so doing. Call it a northeastern regional library. That does not mean the new institution would be just another library or a super-library like an over-tall telephone pole. It would be a departure from any kind of library we know. It would have a special job to do—a job readily identifiable and of central, not peripheral importance. Its job would be to handle for the region to be served those library activities which can be handled more efficiently or more economically through joint auspices and which at the same time lend themselves to being institutionalized. That term “institutionalized” may need to be clarified. Yale and Princeton, for example, could never turn over to a central agency located on neither campus the handling of reserve books required daily in connection with courses of instruction. On the other hand, there is nothing about—say—the placing of periodical subscriptions or the buying of Swedish

geological publications which in itself would prevent the two universities from handling these two activities through a central agency. In fact, the existence of periodical subscription agencies and jobbers illustrates how these very activities have been institutionalized already on a commercial basis.

Now, let us restate the function of the regional research library in the light of this explanation. This new type of library would be designed to handle those library activities to each of which one of the three following statements could be said to apply: (1) This activity can be handled *more efficiently* for society by a central agency than can be done by depending on libraries acting singly; (2) this activity can be handled *more economically* by a central agency than can be done by depending on libraries acting singly; or (3) this activity can be handled *more efficiently* and *more economically* by a central agency than can be done by depending on libraries acting singly. Again repeating for emphasis, the regional library would convert library cooperation into an institution. In so doing, it would seek to put an idea (the idea of concerted activity) and a handful of emerging activities on the inside of the total setup for offering society research library service instead of leaving them attached to the outside of a setup in which they can hardly be said to belong naturally.

What, in detail, are the cooperative activities which make up the program of a regional library conceived along these lines? This question calls for retracing a third path followed by the New York committees.

Beginning last fall, we narrowed to four the areas of library cooperation to be considered in New York during the year 1949-50, and created a separate committee to take charge of studying each area. Around Thanksgiving two committees, one committee headed by John Fall on division of sub-

ject fields, the other by John Berthel on a storage library, began to speak of what they termed variously "a library cooperation center," "a cooperative library," and "a central library serving cooperating institutions." Following their own suggestions, the Steering Committee modified their original assignments and put both committees to work on this new concept, one being given the job of describing the activities of such a cooperative center, the other, the related job of proposing an acceptable scheme of organization and administration. The first written report of these two committees, presented February 15, can be summed up as follows: a simply planned, moderately priced, fireproof building would be erected on a carefully selected site, preferably in Manhattan, where the library would be easily accessible to railway, postal, and other terminals. It would be controlled by a board of governors composed of representatives of subscribing institutions and administered by a librarian supported by an advisory council likewise drawn from subscribing institutions. Its program would be held to whatever limits the method of financing prescribed. The general function of the central cooperative library would be to serve the controlling libraries, and no recommendation was made to include direct service to readers. Its activities would include acquiring and housing publications, whether old or current, cataloging these publications, distributing catalog cards, and reproducing library materials photographically. It would accept custody of material which individual libraries no longer wish to retain on their shelves and in such case, the title would probably pass to the cooperative library. It would not, however, be looked upon primarily as a deposit or dead storage library nor would it limit its acquisitions to materials sent to it from the overcrowded shelves of other libraries.

How competently these committees are

serving us can be seen from the fact that their reports mark the highest water level of agreement yet reached among us. Some would like to go beyond what the committees have thus far recommended, but our ranks hold firm up to the point where they have brought us. The ultimate in fruitful agreement is not necessarily achieved in so short a time; otherwise, I suppose we should have to write off as the highest practicable achievement in international government as amounting at times to little more than agreements that the veto occasionally has its uses—which would be to stop too soon. The possibility of advancing beyond this point raises such questions as the following:

1. *Should the regional library give direct service to readers?* This is a question of critical importance, as it will affect the whole concept of the agency to be established and some are of the opinion that in the long history of the new establishment, it would be shortsighted and unrealistic to try to avoid direct service to readers and that, therefore, it would be best to face up to this necessity before we freeze a decision into brick and steel.

2. *From the professional standpoint, which is preferable, a location close to an existing research library or some miles away from any other library?* What is sound professionally seems to be the only statesmanly approach to the whole undertaking, including the question of location. This matter of proximity to a standard research library assumes large practical importance when we begin to think of an institution which allows readers to come to the book instead of remaining far enough out on the periphery to justify having the books sent on and on forever to the reader. I believe the issue before us will have to be considered on a plane somewhat above suspicion and jealousy. Should the librarians and the institutions which normally should lead the way seek in vain to rise to a plane more in

keeping with the dimensions of the problem and the public interests involved, responsible voices would undoubtedly not fail to question whether the time is ripe, or the auspices the most propitious, to work out a proper solution. This would be a reproach I have every confidence we shall not invite. By way of strengthening our firm resolves in this respect, may I point out that there are two ways by which the barrier of physical distance between the regional library and some standard research library could be removed if we decide that that is the best thing to do. One would be to locate the new agency at or nearby an existing library. The other would be to pick first a site for the regional library according to a set of specifications tailored to fit its requirements, and then move an existing library or libraries to the new site thus chosen.

Such relocation of an existing library may appear at first blush to be absurdly impractical, and possibly it is; but I suggest that we think twice before jumping to that quite natural conclusion. Look around at what is happening. Members of this audience can name important libraries which changing conditions have already crushed, or are crushing, entirely out of independent existence. This phenomenon is new—too new to be sure what it means. Are we witnessing the operation of forces not yet fully comprehended which will bring about in the library world a movement comparable in any sense to the consolidated school movement a generation ago? I do not know, but I cite the facts to help us avoid freezing hasty decisions into brick and steel. If we succeed in building wisely and well, I suspect that we shall in establishing a northeastern regional library not create something peripheral, something apart which can be hidden under a half bushel in the woods somewhere, but a center of such central importance that it will permanently and significantly affect the web of research

library service in the Northeast. If that is likely to be true, it would be regrettable to build without sufficient foresight.

3. *What should the acquisitions program of the northeastern regional library be?* Our committees agree that it should not be confined to acquiring little-used books from cooperating libraries and they even gingerly suggest a separate acquisitions program, presumably tied in closely with that of other libraries in the Northeast; but they have not yet worked out the details.

By way of encouraging these committees, which have at this point come squarely up against the issue of reorganizing our setup *versus* maintaining the status quo, it seems to me that they are on the right track and that a positive acquisitions program should be developed along the following lines:

1. Let the northeastern regional library assume responsibility for organizing through voluntary participation complete coverage of three types of material: (a) publications of importance for research which are originally intended for a limited audience; (b) publications of importance for research which are in less used languages and which can be treated the same as other limited-audience publications; (c) publications of importance for research which, because of obsolescence, serve only a limited audience even though they were intended for a wide audience originally.

2. The northeastern regional library would freely delegate responsibility for limited-audience material to other libraries. It would have no authority to impose any commitments on a cooperating library. Its powers in organizing coverage would be limited to stimulating voluntary commitments and to serve as a clearing house for information about coverage thus effected.

3. The regional library would itself, however, see to it as one of its primary responsibilities that coverage is effected through its own purchasing program wherever dependable voluntary arrangements could not be made. This would be one of the chartered purposes of the new institution.

4. As the reservoir of limited-audience materials for the whole region, the northeastern regional library would accept custody of little-

used materials from other libraries with the understanding that one copy of every item deemed of importance for research would be retained as a part of its permanent holdings. It would ordinarily not accept a second copy if acceptance entailed an obligation to keep it permanently among its holdings, through the strictness of any such principle should be settled in the light of experience.

I am told of uncertainty as to whether a mistake was not made in failing to adopt the second Metcalf report at the meeting of the eight institutions in January. This suggests the propriety of appraising that report in careful terms, for we need the united support of all friends of library cooperation. As a step in this direction, I shall try to give some idea of the thinking of our committees with reference to it. This will take us along the last of the routes to be followed toward the conception of a northeastern regional library as described above. The local division of opinion parallels that of the January meeting with the exception that the proportion of those who would recommend adoption of the report in the form presented there is perhaps lower. The majority would, if I am not mistaken, consider the following to be a fair analysis of strong and weak points:

As of the first quarter of 1950, the second Metcalf report entitled "Proposal for a Northeastern Regional Library" is the most concrete proposal yet developed. It is based on the most extensive canvass yet made of opinion among eight large institutions. Following the general lines laid down in the first report, the second report is essentially a scheme for storing little-used books, and if what we wish is joint storage facilities for a handful of larger libraries—that and nothing more—it would be difficult to improve upon this scheme. Finally, it suggests both a larger region than New York City librarians had, prior to 1950, been considering and a name, "Northeastern Regional Library" which was a splendid

burst of inspiration.

This brings us, however, to the first weakness of the report. A country location is recommended. Such a location is all right for storage purposes, but a name like "Northeastern Regional Library" is too good to waste on a storage library some four miles out of town which can be reached only by station wagon, taxi and snowshoes. This incongruity goes deeper. Along with the name, the prospect of unlimited growth and inconclusive intimations of possible usefulness as time goes on are congruent with something more than a storage library, but the statement of the problem, the program as laid out, the decision to exclude cooperative buying and cataloging "for the present if not indefinitely," the physical isolation of the library, type of staff and limited guest accommodations are all more congruent with the storage concept underlying, for example, the New England Deposit Library. Third, something is lacking in the conception itself. The lack resembles the dependence of the unborn child for oxygen on the parent respiratory system. Perhaps the most precise way to express it is to say that the new establishment is conceived less as a change in the structure of research library service than as an excrescence or adjunct to that setup—suspended, as it were, by anchor lines from supporting libraries. Fourth, the report's disarming treatment of what Nietzsche would call the human all too human capacity for jealousy is hardly matched by its treatment of the equally human capacity to deal with professional problems on a professional plane. Fifth, fixing attention on a particular site so early in the game leaves something to be desired from the standpoint of procedure. In coupling the whole idea so closely to a given site, it resembles suggesting—let us say—not that we have a U.N., but that we have a U.N.-in-San Francisco. Sixth, the financing showed costs which convinced no one that he was getting a very handsome

bargain and depended, moreover, on enough appropriating bodies with heavily burdened budgets to forecast a shaky future for the undertaking.

As to financing, one New York librarian has electrified us with what I believe is the most original suggestion yet made. I hope it can be discussed today. It is that New York State and the eight other states in the Northeast be invited to join in supporting a northeastern regional library at public expense. To insure an equitable distribution of responsibility, in such case, a special interstate authority would probably be called for.

Here, then, in summary are some suggestions for starting off today's discussion:

1. The suggestion to consider further what it is we conceive the problem facing the research library to be at this juncture.

2. The specific suggestion about conceiving the problem as basically one of reorganizing to some extent the setup by which research library service is provided.

3. The further suggestion that a regional library be created which shall be neither another library of the standard type nor a storage library off to one side of things, but a new mechanism of more or less central importance in the setup to provide research library service in the Northeast.

4. The suggestion that much Farmington Plan material on one hand and many of the materials which would normally be sent to a joint storage center, on the other, perform a common intellectual function—that namely of serving a limited audience—and that this function of making available limited-audience material lends itself to being institutionalized in a separate program.

5. The parallel suggestion that there may be a fundamental weakness or two in theory in Farmington Plan procedure and that a northeastern regional library, properly supported, would offer greater promise of making the objectives of the Farmington Plan an indigenous part of the research library setup.

6. The suggestion that a northeastern regional library conceived along these lines is the most efficient and the most economical means within reach of organizing effort to retain control over the written record of the

mind.

7. The suggestion that the northeastern states would see in the northeastern regional library an opportunity of such significance to promote access to this record, and thereby to nurture scholarship, that they would wish to join in giving the undertaking the moral and financial support it will require to become a reality.

Is a northeastern regional library a practical possibility? It depends on how much effort is put into making it so. Six years and two months ago, the Association of Research Libraries concluded a meeting in this city with this question: Do we have adequate machinery to deal with library and other cultural problems which the world is going to face when the war is over? Do we not need what we fumblingly called that day a cultural league of nations? That meeting was the beginning of one rill in a watershed of exertions which in two years was to produce Unesco. The A.R.L. takes pride in having spread on its minutes before it adjourned that day one of the quite early motions taken toward forming Unesco, but after adjournment when the brass-tacks cloakroom discussions began, the big question was, "Is this idea really practical, or is it idle dreaming?"

One further word of encouragement. While this paper was being written, I happened to read the following words of a well-known American industrialist who, in the face of folk legend that no man would ever walk across the raging Columbia River and in the face of warnings even from engineers that its thundering torrents would rip to shreds any works of puny man to dam it, nevertheless went ahead and constructed the Bonneville Dam down across the lower waters of the Columbia. Undaunted faith, he says, surmounted the last formidable obstacle "and proved that what men can dare and imagine, they can find ways to accomplish."

## A Proposal for a Northeastern Regional Library<sup>1</sup>

*Dr. Metcalf is director, Harvard University Library.*

DR. WHITE's paper was very interesting, and provides a good background for what I have to say. I do not think that we are very far apart in most respects and, in the places where we may seem to disagree, I hope you will keep in mind these three points:

1. The ideas and plans that I shall state are not original with me.
2. I am ready to change them at any time if that is what other librarians want; but
3. I do want a regional library in which the great libraries of the northeastern states will cooperate.

I should try to start at the beginning by picturing the way we have been thinking on the subject at Harvard and, I believe, at Yale, too. Please remember that Harvard will have more than 5,500,000 volumes and pamphlets in its library by sometime next year, and that it is spending on its library the income of well over \$40,000,000—something like \$1,750,000 a year—which makes a very appreciable hole in the university's total endowment. Harvard is ahead of the others at present, but not very far. It is 65 years older than Yale and 10 to 12 years ahead in the size of its library. All of us are growing rapidly enough to cause great concern.

This great size has come by geometric growth, which we do not seem able to stop completely, though it may be fair to say that

some progress has been made. This growth at Harvard and other research institutions has made library expenditures tend to increase more rapidly than those of other parts of the university, chiefly because of costs of building construction and upkeep. We probably should have realized this a generation or so ago, but we failed to see how serious it was because we were then living through a remarkable building era. Because of inflation, we now feel it more sharply than would normally be the case.

The gravity of the situation in many universities can be described bluntly: If libraries continue to grow as in the past, and if we have a reasonably stable economy and income, one or more professors will have to be dropped each year in order to keep the library going. This is certainly intolerable and cannot be defended if we are now spending enough for our libraries. We must decide what percentage of total expenditures the library should take, and try to stick to that figure. We shall have to find a way out of our dilemma.

This situation brought about the New England Deposit Library, which has been successful in every way but one. It has not succeeded in eliminating duplicates already acquired by the cooperating libraries or in reducing duplication of current acquisitions as had been hoped. The reason for this failure, we believe, is that the larger libraries, which occupy some four-fifths of the space in the New England Deposit Library—the Massachusetts State Library, the Boston Public Library, and

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at the meeting of the New York Library Association, New York City, April 29, 1950.

Harvard—are different in character; their collections as a whole, and therefore their less-used books, tend not to overlap. Consequently it has seemed to those who were particularly interested that, if a cooperative storage library is to do more than provide cheap storage space, it should include a considerable number of large general research libraries owning little-used collections that would overlap. There is no one place in the Northeast where you can find many such collections. New York City, Boston and Philadelphia have tremendous concentrations of book resources, but it takes a whole region to provide enough large general research libraries to make a start. Harvard, Yale, Columbia, the New York Public Library, Princeton, and Pennsylvania have some 17,500,000 volumes in all, and there must be a great amount of duplication in the collections already owned and in current acquisitions of bulky, little-used materials. Because they contain a large proportion of the duplicated little-used books to be found in northeastern libraries, they seem to be the best with which to start; the last meeting, to which Dr. White referred, included representatives of these six libraries plus Cornell, the only other general research library in the section with more than a million volumes, and the Library of Congress.

The first step in our thinking, then, was that the library we had in mind must cover the whole region to be really worth while. Now, before we go on with the proposal, let me insert a basic principle of library philosophy and administration that we have held at Harvard and that affected our thinking and planning. We believe that one of the great difficulties in all libraries is that they get too complicated. We also believe that one of the obstacles to starting anything new in libraries is that the original plan tends to be too complicated. Because we believe this at Harvard, our cataloging is simpler than in most other places and

probably, as a result, unorthodox. We give less reference service than most other libraries. Our charging systems are kept as simple as possible. We even like to use simple words—instead of saying “cubicle” in three syllables or “carrell” in two, we use monosyllabic “stalls.” An example of an attempt to avoid complexity in a new proposal is the Farmington Plan, which has now been operating for more than two years. It is a noble experiment, as was said of prohibition. It has not always run smoothly. It is very easily criticized. It does not, for instance, include periodicals and other serials, which are the most important research materials in many subject fields. It does not include books in non-Latin alphabets despite the importance of Russia in the world today. But, if it works at all and if it gradually improves, that may well be because it has not tried to do everything at once.

We started, as I have said, with the belief that we ought to have a cooperative library covering the whole region to help us take care of our less-used, bulky collections and to eliminate unnecessary duplication, and we thought that the plans with which we started ought not to be too complicated. After his assistant, Edwin E. Williams, had visited the large libraries concerned, the speaker made a tentative proposal to serve as a basis for discussion by the eight libraries that have been named. It includes the following points, which have been revised since the January meeting in an attempt to make them reflect the thinking of the group at that time:

1. It is suggested that the institutions mentioned above take the lead in forming the proposed library, but that they welcome others (principally large research libraries) that may care to join them. This proposal has been criticized as too exclusive. I see no reason why small as well as large libraries should not cooperate in the plan if they are ready to pay their share of the costs.

It should be remembered, however, that the large libraries will benefit most by eliminating duplication both of material already acquired and of unnecessary, little-used acquisitions in the future. They will have the most to contribute and the most to gain, but I see no reason for excluding smaller institutions.

2. It is proposed that the library be called the Northeastern Regional Library, as that name covers the Middle Atlantic and New England states and makes it clear that the institution is a regional library. A longer name seems unnecessary and undesirable.

3. The library should have a charter providing for tax-exemption and making it possible for the cooperating libraries to place books there under conditions proposed below. In order to obtain such a charter, legal advice should be sought as to its contents and the best place to obtain it.

4. The selection of books for the regional library is a major problem. It is suggested as a basis for discussion that much of the material sent in the original selection be from the fields in which the materials are bulky and in which no one of the libraries has a really great collection, but in which the combined resources might be superior to any now to be found in this country and important enough to attract scholars. These collections might be of widely different types; first of all (probably less important than some others in the long run, but of special importance in getting started) would be material that is now a problem because it requires a good deal of space and is not much used. Cooperative purchase might not be involved here. The following categories are suggested:

(a) Textbooks, particularly secondary and elementary school textbooks. If a number of the libraries sent those published in the United States between 1820 and the comparatively recent past (if not the present), the combined collections would provide many duplicates for discarding or shipping to another regional library, and would

form a better collection than can now be found anywhere in the country. (Harvard has about 50,000 volumes that it would seriously consider sending.)

(b) Administrative publications of colleges, universities, and schools. If the great bulk of these could be placed under one roof, it would create a great collection and eliminate many duplicates.

(c) Dogmatic theology and Bibles published after 1800. Scholars should find it useful to have a single large collection.

(d) Old books on the physical sciences and medicine that are out of date and of little importance in connection with the history of these fields.

(e) Old editions of Greek and Latin classics, particularly nineteenth century editions from other countries.

(f) Translations from one modern language into a second other than English.

(g) Juvenile literature published after 1840.

(h) Minor fiction by English, American, French, and German authors.

A second type of material, one that in the end might be more important than the first, consists of bulky collections that are difficult to keep up to date and that probably do not need to be duplicated within the area. Two important categories can be suggested in this group:

(a) Public documents from American states and municipalities; foreign municipal documents; and foreign national documents except those of Great Britain, Canada, Germany, France and Russia. Each library might keep the state documents for its own region and for certain other states or countries on which it has special collections, but, if material of this kind could be gathered in one place, the resulting collection would be far superior to anything that can be found at present except, possibly, in the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library. These document sets should of course be kept up to date, and there would be a great saving if this were

done only at the regional library. Files would be maintained at just one place, and a better job could be done there than is now done in any library other than the Library of Congress.

(b) Serial publications, including periodicals of various kinds. These would include journals of learned societies and other publications used chiefly for advanced research in which not very many individuals would be engaged. There would be great savings in money and space if collections of this type from half a dozen large research libraries could be combined, if duplicates were eliminated, and if the files were then kept up in a regional library.

A third major class might be constituted by the Farmington Plan acquisitions of libraries in this section. It has been suggested that research libraries in the Northeast ought, between them, to acquire one copy of most of the Farmington books, even if other copies are to be found further west or south.

Rarities, presumably, would be retained by the libraries that own them, but a number of special collections seem to be suitable for deposit, among them:

(a) Collections in minor languages, particularly when two or more of the cooperating libraries have fairly strong little-used collections and when consolidation would make a great collection. (For example, the Friesian collections at the New York Public, Pennsylvania, and Harvard, and the Icelandic collections at Cornell, Harvard, the New York Public, and Yale.)

(b) Broken sets of any periodical when combination of files would produce a complete or more nearly complete run than can now be found in any single library.

(c) Books on nonacademic subjects such as sports and games, "pseudosciences," and shorthand.

(d) Patents, foreign dissertations, trade catalogs, and certain kinds of legal material are also possibilities.

5. It is proposed that material sent to the

regional library be on permanent deposit. The decision on this point is vital because the permanent withdrawal of a deposited book after other copies had been discarded would seriously complicate matters. (The question of transferring legal title could still, of course, depend on the wishes of the individual cooperating libraries.)

6. The next problem is the kind of installation that should be provided. How much land ought to be acquired? If a country location is chosen, it might be proper to obtain more land than would be acquired in a city, and this would provide room for more or less indefinite expansion. Wherever it is located, the building should be erected on a unit plan that would facilitate enlargement. It should certainly include:

(a) A large amount of cheap shelving for book storage.

(b) A shipping room, work room, office space, and toilet facilities.

(c) A station wagon and a truck should probably be provided as part of the original equipment.

But other questions arise here. Should there be a reading room, or are the books to be used only when borrowed by other libraries? Will the library have to buy and catalog reference books? Will any other facilities, such as a lunchroom and even sleeping accommodations, be required? These questions cannot be decided until the location has been determined. It may well be that we have gone far enough by making the proposals already listed, and that there should be no discussion of possible locations for fear it will complicate the problem—something that I said is undesirable—and because it might stir up discussions that would make cooperation more difficult in the future. It seems to me, however, that this question is so basic that it should be considered at an early stage. Here I can speak only for myself. I have made a proposal that some of you know about, and I can at least explain what went through my

mind before I made it.

Other things being equal (which, of course, they are not), I should say without hesitation that there are two essentials in choosing a location:

(a) It should be as central as possible and convenient to the largest possible number of persons among those who will want to use the library.

(b) The new institution should be attached to a great library already in existence, and preferably under the same roof. The complications that arise when a library is set up at a distance from a good reference collection are shown by the experience of the Huntington Library in California, the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, and many others.

With these two essentials in mind, I think we should all agree that the proper place for the Northeastern Regional Library would seem to be at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue, New York. Unfortunately, we know that the New York Public Library building is full already and that, even if funds could be obtained for adding to that building, there would not be room for the millions of books that will, we hope, be located in the regional library within a generation. There seems to be no prospect that the City Park Commissioner will allow us to build a regional library in Bryant Park, and the cost of other land in the neighborhood would certainly be prohibitive. Apparently this ideal location will have to be abandoned.

Now I come to a problem about which I hesitate to speak because it probably shows my own smallness and the smallness that I attribute to other members of my profession and, for that matter, to the academic world in general. Why not attach the Northeastern Regional Library to one of the great university libraries in the section? The three most centrally located ones are Columbia, Yale, and Princeton. I do not believe that the Yale faculty and administration—leaving the library out of consideration—

or the Columbia faculty and administration, or the Harvard faculty and administration would agree any time within the next 10 years to transfer a large part of its library book collections to the campus of one of the other university libraries, and we might just as well admit it. Some have suggested that we work out an exchange, sending for instance all documents to one library, all Swedish books to another, etc. Again, I am afraid it would not work, and for the same reason. In addition, it should be remembered that one of the chief reasons for talking about this regional library is that space on a college campus is so expensive. Buildings there must be of high quality, land is not plentiful, and costs tend to rise unduly. If, then, it seems impossible to have the library in or closely attached to the New York Public Library at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue, and if we are agreed (I still admit in spite of what I have said that this is a debatable matter) that it should not be on the campus of one of the present libraries, where should it be? Again, we come back to my original proposition that it should be as conveniently located as possible, but the cost should be kept in mind. New York City is certainly central for the whole Northeast, but almost any land near the heart of the city is expensive, and to acquire space sufficient for indefinite expansion would be very costly. If we go out to the edges of the city—to Staten Island, the northern Bronx, or the eastern part of Queensborough, to say nothing of north Jersey—we can avoid some of the expense, and these locations certainly ought to be considered. I have suggested, however, a location near the Merritt Parkway north of Stamford in the belief that it would be more convenient to most users than any place that could be found in an out-of-the-way part of New York City. Most of the books and most of the users are likely to come from institutions and locations having ready access to the railroad from Washington to Boston

and to the super-highway that runs, or soon will run, from the vicinity of Philadelphia to Boston. This would seem to suggest that the library, if it is not to be located in the heart of New York City or immediately adjacent to one of the university libraries, should be fairly close to either the Pennsylvania or the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railway. I have no ax to grind for Stamford, and any other equally convenient place, if agreed upon by the others, would suit me just as well. What have you to suggest?

It may be worth while to recapitulate a few points that ought to be considered in choosing a location:

(a) Land in a large city is expensive except on the outskirts, which may well be as difficult of access as a country location.

(b) Costs in general are apt to be higher in a city than elsewhere.

(c) City atmospheric conditions make air conditioning desirable, but it is expensive.

(d) It is difficult to arrange for indefinite expansion in a city.

(e) A location beside or in one of the cooperating libraries is certain sooner or later to cause jealousy. This, I am afraid, has already proved to be one of the most serious problems facing the Midwest Inter-library Corporation. A city location not close to an existing library has little to recommend it.

(f) A city location may be less safe in an atomic age than one in the country.

(g) A city location will attract unnecessary and perhaps undesired use, which might add considerably to the cost of the whole operation.

(h) The Midwest Inter-library Corporation is in a great city and adjacent to a great library; it may be worth while to experiment with a different plan for the Northeastern Regional Library, and the fact that it is different might make it easier to finance the proposed library.

Let us now go back to the type of in-

stallation. When we have decided where to build, the question will come up as to whether the library should contain a reading room or should require that books be used only in the cooperating or other libraries. Again, it is easy to argue on either side. I should hesitate to advocate a reading room if the library were anywhere within five miles of 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue, because of the users who might be attracted and resultant costs. On the other hand, if the library were to be at Stamford, I should feel strongly that a scholar who came and wanted to work intensively in a field covered by the collection ought to be able to do so in a reading room close to the books he would be consulting. But this raises a new problem. If the library is to be in the country and is to have a reading room, then restaurant facilities and perhaps sleeping accommodations also must be provided. With this in mind, my suggestion included a guest house for users of the library as well as a lunchroom, and I even proposed that during the first few years the guest house might well include quarters for the librarian and possibly some members of the staff.

One of the most complicated and difficult problems that a regional library would have to face is cooperative or centralized buying and cataloging. I have suggested as a basis for discussion that, while it would be a mistake to say that cooperative acquisition and cataloging should never be developed at the Northeastern Regional Library, it might be unwise to include either in the original plan, or as an integral part of the proposal. The enterprise is intricate enough without. But I did suggest that an exception might be made for Farmington Plan books—if the cooperating libraries were willing to have their Farmington Plan books sent there these might be cataloged at the expense of the regional library. There may be great advantages in such a procedure for Farmington books from countries using "minor" languages.

I must add—and this is another debatable question—that there are surely good grounds for the feeling of Dr. White and of Mr. Beals of the New York Public Library that the most important part of the regional library will be its acquisition program for bulky collections of documents, periodicals, etc., and I think the decision should be made by the cooperating libraries and certainly not by Keyes Metcalf.

The points that have been raised are important, as are many others that might be considered. There can be arguments on either side, but many of the final decisions will probably have to be made on the basis of costs. Expenditures in carrying out the proposal would fall naturally into the following categories:

(a) The original cost of the land, the building, and other essential equipment.

(b) The cost of sending the first shipments from the cooperating libraries to the Northeastern Regional Library.

(c) The current expenses for service in the library, including the use of the collections, physical care of the building, the guest house (if one is provided), and the automobile.

(d) The cost of servicing interlibrary loans.

(e) The cost of additions to the building as time goes on.

(f) The cost of any cooperative acquisition of cataloging that is done.

I have made some rough estimates for each of these. The original plant might well cost \$1,000,000. I have suggested that the regional library try to finance the cost of shipping the first million volumes to it, pointing out that it would go a long way toward giving the library a good start if \$100,000 could be provided for this, because libraries would hurry up their shipments in order to take advantage of the offer. I have estimated the cost of current expenses at \$55,000 per year. The actual figure will depend very largely in the long

run on whether the staff is simply a service staff or must also undertake acquisition and cataloging. The figure will grow rapidly in the latter case.

Also as a basis for discussion, I suggested that service charges for use of the collection might be agreed upon, and proposed a scale of charges to cover interlibrary loan expenses.

I believe that the cost of additional units of the building when they are needed will be a serious problem and should not be overlooked when making the original plans.

The figures that have been indicated for expenditures run very high, and I think it only fair to admit that three or four million dollars should be available or in sight if the library is to go ahead on the scale proposed. Where can the funds be obtained? There seem to be four possible sources:

(a) One or more of the philanthropic foundations.

(b) Individuals who, whether or not they now have any affiliation with a university or research library, may be interested in library development and in solving the problem of geometric growth of libraries.

(c) The cooperating institutions.

(d) Governmental agencies—the Federal government, either directly or through the Library of Congress, and, as Dr. White has suggested, possibly an interstate library authority for the region.

All of these should be explored. None of them can be expected to help unless there is a reasonable agreement on the plan by the libraries concerned, and it is therefore of great importance that there be thoroughgoing discussion of the various points on which disagreement may arise. I hope the debate will be full and free; as I said at the beginning, I should like you to remember that this is not my plan and that I am ready to have changes made in it, but that I do want a regional library for the Northeast.

By MORRIS A. GELFAND

## Library Cooperation in Metropolitan New York: Report of Work in Progress<sup>1</sup>

*Mr. Gelfand is librarian, Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.*

THIS report on library cooperation in Metropolitan New York is limited to a description of the activities of a group of librarians who were brought together as a result of discussions of library cooperation initiated early in 1948 by Raymond B. Fosdick and Devereaux C. Josephs, then presidents, respectively, of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It is a report of work in progress; no conclusions or recommendations can be presented at this time.

The foundations indicated their interest in the subject on Jan. 20, 1948, at a dinner to which they had invited representatives of the governing boards of several institutions of higher education and of some libraries. The occasion was notable for an agreement that, for various reasons, among them the rapidly diminishing financial resources on which private libraries and educational institutions have depended, the possibilities of cooperation should be studied with a view toward helping the libraries of metropolitan New York to meet their service obligations at a minimum cost. It was further agreed that the representatives present would un-

dertake to support such activity as might be found practicable. The foundations did not commit themselves to any particular action in this connection.

On Feb. 12, 1948, the foundations gave another dinner. On this occasion the guests were, in the main, the librarians from the institutions represented at the original dinner. The discussion of library cooperation was continued by the librarians who, as might be expected, agreed unanimously on the need for closer cooperation and discussed specific proposals for achieving this objective. Then there followed the activity that will be described here.

A group of 26 librarians, including those who had attended the dinner meeting but representing a larger number of different types of libraries was invited by Dr. Carl M. White on Feb. 24, 1948, to discuss cooperation. The organization of this group was informal and remains so. In preparation for this meeting White asked each of 12 librarians to come prepared to discuss a particular aspect of the subject. Most of these librarians, in turn, invited small groups of colleagues to join them in discussing their subjects.

The 12 topics presented at the February 24 meeting could be grouped into four large categories: (1) Resources, (2) Readers, (3) Technical services and operations, and (4) Physical problems.

Most of the reports presented at this

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at the General Session, A.C.R.L., Chicago, January 28, 1950.

(Editor's Note: Attention is called to the paper by Dr. Carl M. White, also included in this issue. Although the papers by Mr. Gelfand and Dr. White were prepared independently, readers will find that they supplement each other.)

meeting, although hastily prepared, represented in remarkable degree the major problems with which librarians are faced in the consideration of these four categories.

The first meeting of the larger group served to open wide the whole complex problem of cooperation and explored some of the possible approaches to the problem. The second meeting, which took place on March 12 was devoted to a discussion of the 12 reports presented at the previous meeting, and also to an analysis of the problem of library cooperation by Archibald MacLeish, as well as to finding what Carl White called "a handle" by which the committee could take hold and get under way.

MacLeish's analysis was, in a sense, a philosophical approach to a determination of the place and function of the library in our society. His remarks were applicable to library problems generally although they were directed specifically to the problems of library cooperation in New York.<sup>2</sup> He said:

The real problem is . . . not whether libraries *ought* to cooperate . . . the problem is not whether cooperation is *possible*. . . . The real problem is *in what way* to cooperate: *to what end?* Which raises the fundamental question which must be examined before a program of cooperation can be devised:

What is a library in our kind of world and what function does it exist to perform?

.....  
Considered in relation to the requirements of a society such as ours, it will become apparent that the library function is not the function of social memory alone—the mere preservation of records—but a much more active and creative function which can best be described by likening the library in a contemporary society to the nervous system in a physical organism—an instrument not of memory alone but of memory plus communication plus impulse to action plus reflection upon action.

<sup>2</sup> The following quotations from MacLeish are taken from a letter which he wrote to Ralph A. Beals in which he restated the principal points that he presented at the March 12 meeting. MacLeish's letter appears as Appendix I to "Library Cooperation in Metropolitan New York; Report of a Second Meeting of New York City Librarians, March 12, 1948." 11p. Mimeographed.

Considered in this relation it will be apparent, also, that libraries are not and cannot be independent and autonomous institutions however their directors and trustees and benefactors may wish to make them so. They are units in a system which is as extensive—or should be as extensive—as the society (and ideally of the civilization). They constitute together one system.

How well do libraries perform this function: how well do they function as the nervous system of a vast, complicated and closely integrated organism? Librarians generally will agree, even without a detailed survey, that the American library system, which is probably better than any other national system, performs this function in a spotty way. It is like a nervous system made up of trunk nerves to the right hand and the left toe. Not to push the physiological analogy too far, American technological society is comparable in some ways to the sabertooth and other huge animals which were superseded not because they lacked strength but, apparently, because their nervous systems were inadequate to their bulk. Librarians will probably agree also that the underlying trouble with the American library system is that it is not systematic.

Then MacLeish gave his approach to the solution of the question, "How do you systematize a system that is not systematic?" His principal contribution at this point, it seemed to me, was to be found in the first step of the approach that he suggested:

You begin by trying to reach agreement as to what the system has to do in the area under study. This is an inquiry at the highest levels of intellectual statesmanship. It is, however, a labor which librarians are peculiarly equipped to accomplish. They know, or can know, what the demands upon their system are and—more important and difficult—they can conceive *what those demands ought to be if the system really worked*. They also are competent to evaluate these demands qualitatively as well as quantitatively. My principal complaint about librarians in universities and public administrations is that they are too humble—too willing to be turned into superior janitors. They and they alone have the knowledge to *plan* and *control* the functioning of this most essential of social organs.

They belong in the GHQs—the planning boards—of their universities and cities. The problem this committee is dealing with will never be solved intelligently and with technical competence until librarians demand that authority for themselves and exercise it.

It was finally agreed at the March 12 meeting that the group would continue its investigation of the possibilities of cooperation. A small committee was appointed by Dr. White to "lay out concrete proposals for action."<sup>3</sup> This committee was composed of Ralph A. Beals, chairman, Ernest Hettich, and R. W. G. Vail.

No further action was taken until May 28, 1948, when the New York Library Club sponsored an open forum on library cooperation at its annual meeting. The club membership was provided with a brief summary of the preliminary discussions on cooperation through the medium of the New York Library Club *Bulletin*.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Beals and his committee were invited to present their report at the forum.

The Beals committee stated that it was not in a position to present a final report but that it was prepared to discuss certain aspects of the problem of cooperation. The committee indicated that it was interested primarily in research libraries, "somewhat" in "working" or "reference" libraries and very little in "popular" libraries. It was pointed out that there are about 400 reference and research libraries in the metropolitan area but that these libraries in no way constitute a system. The character of the clientele of reference and research libraries was discussed and their requirements and size received attention. Changing concepts concerning the functions of research libraries were noted.

Under the heading, "Cooperative activity that can be effected within the present

framework, with no new 'machinery' and at little or no expense," the Beals committee listed the following:

1. The elimination of duplication of little-used materials in a subject field coupled with the extension of the coverage in that field.
2. Division of fields with a view to coverage: *i.e.*, a "little Farmington Plan."
3. Re-examination of the provision for particular groups or users of classes of publications.
4. Coordination and integration of present procedures.
5. Subject inventories.

Cooperation activity that requires new "machinery" and added expense, at least in initiating stages, included, according to this committee:

1. Provision of additional reference libraries.
2. Deposit libraries
  - a. "Passive": little-used materials.
  - b. "Active": "reserve" library for acquisition, cataloging and lending (to libraries) of new publications as they appear in categories like government documents of smaller states, non-Anglo-American law, publications of minor societies and academies, etc.
3. Cooperative buying and cataloging.
4. Union catalogs: general, special, finding lists.
5. Disposal of duplicates.
6. Binding.
7. Photographic reproduction.<sup>5</sup>

The Beals committee discussion took place verbally and informally but it served a most useful purpose by defining further the scope and character of library cooperation as viewed by the group originally formed to investigate that subject, and by

<sup>3</sup> White, Carl M. "Memorandum to the Librarians of New York Libraries." 2p. Mimeographed.

<sup>4</sup> New York Library Club. *Bulletin*, 36:16-17, May 1948.

<sup>5</sup> From a mimeographed outline prepared by the Beals committee for their use in the discussion on May 28, 1948.

informing New York librarians at large about some of the difficult problems that arise in the consideration of cooperative activities.

There was no important activity during the summer months, a condition that will be familiar to most of us. In the fall members of the committee, faced with increasingly heavy burdens in connection with their regular responsibilities, were unable to devote any time to the project.

Although formal activity had come to a standstill the problems that had been uncovered and the need for cooperation persisted. In the fall of 1949, therefore, Dr. White decided to make an attempt to resume the discussions and investigations relating to library cooperation. On October 18 he invited five librarians—members of the original group—to join him in forming a steering committee, by way of continuing the leadership that had asserted itself previously and of sharing with him the responsibility for developing a practical program of cooperation.

The Steering Committee decided that its principal functions would be to:

1. Initiate proposals for library cooperation.
2. Form committees of personnel other than Steering Committee members to study and investigate these proposals.
3. Direct the conduct of any investigations undertaken by such committees by calling for preliminary outlines of the problems to be studied, progress reports and final reports.
4. Maintain close liaison with project committees by assigning Steering Committee members to serve as liaison officers on project committees when advisable.<sup>6</sup>

Membership of the Steering Committee, in addition to Dr. White, includes: Ralph A. Beals, director, New York Public Li-

brary; Sidney B. Hill, librarian, Association of the Bar of the City of New York; R. W. G. Vail, director, New York Historical Society; Jerome K. Wilcox, librarian, The City College; and Morris A. Gelfand, librarian, Queens College, who was elected secretary.

The Steering Committee decided at its first meeting to adopt for investigation four subjects suggested by Wilcox, with the object of reaching a conclusive point in each before the end of May 1950. These subjects were:

1. Division of subject fields.
2. A deposit library.
3. Messenger service.
4. Improvement of library service in colleges and universities.

It was agreed that this committee should not take upon itself the burden of active participation in and administration of projects initiated by it. The procedure would normally consist of recruiting competent personnel from outside the ranks of the committee to direct and serve on project committees, each organized to study a specific proposal. The Steering Committee would assure itself that the proposal was well outlined, the problem thoroughly understood, by the project committee. It would call for and discuss reports from project committees and consider appropriate action when final reports were received.

At subsequent meetings the Steering Committee defined the geographical area of cooperative activity,<sup>7</sup> and reaffirmed its intention to aim at coordination of library facilities and services primarily to encourage their economical use for research and investigation.

By Dec. 12, 1949, four project com-

<sup>7</sup> The definition of the New York-Northeastern New Jersey area, as supplied by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, was accepted subject to later modification should that prove desirable: New York City (Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties); Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester counties, New York; Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Passaic, Somerset and Union counties, New Jersey.

<sup>6</sup> "Minutes of the Steering Committee on Cooperation among Libraries of Metropolitan New York." 1949-50. p. 1.

mittees had been fully organized. John Fall, chief of acquisitions, New York Public Library, agreed to head a committee on the division of subject fields; John Berthel, Nicholas Murray Butler Librarian, at Columbia University, accepted the chairmanship of the committee on a storage library; Wayne Shirley, director of the Pratt Institute Library and dean of the library school there, and Donald Wasson, assistant librarian, Council on Foreign Relations, agreed to head the committee on improvement of library service and the committee on messenger service, respectively.

Preliminary reports of the Subject Fields Committee and the Storage Library Committee were considered concurrently. Each of these committees had asked for further instruction concerning its investigation. It was found that a fundamental subject, common to both these reports, was the question as to whether the Steering Committee wished to investigate the possibilities of a central cooperative library instead of limiting itself to consideration of a deposit library. The central cooperative library was envisioned as an organization that would fulfil not only the storage function of a deposit library but also additional service functions that would make possible a larger number of cooperative activities in the areas of acquisition, cataloging, photographic services, reference work, interlibrary loans, and related activities.

The Steering Committee agreed to authorize these project committees to investigate the possibilities of a central cooperative library and agreed further that the following division of duties would be recommended to the project committees:

1. Questions relating to *management and organization* would be investigated by the Berthel committee.

2. *Contents and program* would be considered by the Fall committee.<sup>8</sup>

There is nothing more to report at this time except that the four project committees are at work and it is hoped that their final reports will be completed this spring. If the time schedule is met, the Steering Committee hopes to be in a position to give careful consideration to the proposals of the project committees and to move ahead to a final decision by the end of May 1950.

I cannot speak for the Steering Committee with respect to the possible outcomes of the investigations now sponsored by it but I would offer a personal opinion. I believe a good working approach to the problems of cooperation is being developed. At the very least, I should expect that we shall learn more about the resources and services of our neighbors, more about the clientele we serve. We shall have added to our experience in studying the organization of cooperative projects, and we shall probably discover personnel who have demonstrated a high capacity for investigating library problems.

The problems involved in the organization of a large scale cooperative project; fiscal, legal, psychological and others, are so complex that I would not offer an opinion at this time as to the possibility of organizing, let us say, a central cooperative library in the near future. But I believe that such a library or similar cooperative agencies inevitably will be organized in the New York area. The libraries of New York and for that matter those in the rest of the country cannot operate indefinitely without controlling their growth, coordinating their activities and re-examining their capacity to perform their basic functions.

<sup>8</sup> "Minutes of the Steering Committee. . . " 1949-50. p.6.

## Microfilming Abroad<sup>1</sup>

*Dr. Born is special assistant on Microfilm Program, Library of Congress*

UNDER this not too informative title (purposely not too informative, so that I might have complete freedom to move with the data which I have been able to assemble in the time available) I propose to speak briefly on several diverse but closely integrated matters which enter into any consideration of an extensive program of microfilming cultural materials. First, I should like to reiterate the several pronouncements of policy now in effect at the Library of Congress. Next, I should like to expand these statements with reference to current plans, and to make certain additions, including a word about cooperation. Thirdly, I should like to offer in evidence as supporting data for the above a brief résumé of activities up to this date. Next, I should like to refer briefly to the general problems inherent in microfilming projects and to the literature on the subject. And, lastly, I should like to add a very few words about the situation abroad with respect to microfilm facilities.

### *Policy Statements Reiterated*

Just one year ago Dan Lacy, then assistant director for acquisitions, Processing Department, Library of Congress, appeared before this group and presented a series of provocative arguments together with a statement of the position already taken by the Library of Congress with respect to many of them.<sup>2</sup> On Sept. 6, 1949, Dr. Luther

H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, addressed the First Congress of Historians of Mexico and the United States at Monterrey, Mexico on "The Preservation of the Documentation on the History of the Americas."<sup>3</sup> The common thread of argument in both papers is the urgent need for cooperation in cultural enterprises. The common pronouncement of the Library of Congress is a forthright statement of its willingness to cooperate, its willingness to offer leadership, its intention to take positive action. Neither of these papers reached the library world without warning. I have found, for example, a dittographed proposal entitled "Interlibrary Cooperation in Microfilming Significant Runs of Library Materials,"<sup>4</sup> which is dated Nov. 2, 1944, and a development of those notes which is dated Dec. 20, 1946<sup>5</sup> and covered by a letter of the same date from the Librarian of Congress to Paul North Rice, executive secretary, Association of Research Libraries (both mimeographed).

The keynote to any extensive program is found in the statement of Dr. Evans, that "now more than ever the great libraries in the relative safety of the Western World share a heavy responsibility to civilization for the very continuity of enlightenment. We of this generation shall not have met that responsibility until we have done our utmost to reproduce and store beyond the reach of destruction the irreplaceable cul-

Tool: Policies, Plans and Problems," *Library of Congress Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*, 6:8-17, May 1949.

<sup>2</sup> Evans, Luther H. "The Preservation of the Documentation on the History of the Americas." *Ibid.*, 7:3-8, November, 1949.

<sup>3</sup> Prepared in the Library of Congress. 4p.

<sup>4</sup> Interlibrary Cooperation in Microfilming Extensive Runs of Library Materials. 4p.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read essentially in its present form at the Acquisition Department Heads of Research Libraries Round Table, A.L.A. Midwinter Meeting, Chicago, Jan. 26, 1950.

<sup>2</sup> Lacy, Dan. "Microfilming as a Major Acquisitions

tural resources of mankind."<sup>6</sup> The policy is not merely a passive one of preservation, it is also an active one of security through understanding. "Because every nation's future is so intimately dependent on the rest of the world, it becomes a peculiar responsibility of libraries to enrich the resources upon which scholars may draw in furthering the understanding of all countries—the understanding not only of their contemporary problems and their immediate purposes, but of the deep currents of their history. We shall not have met that responsibility until we have done all that we can to place at the command of scholars in our respective countries the basic historical sources of all cultures."<sup>7</sup>

Obviously the assumption of this responsibility is no matter to be taken lightly. It will overtax the resources of even the greatest libraries acting singly. Little permanent good will be afforded by the institution which does less than an excellent job, and no credit will fall to the burden bearer who falters in his step. The objective has been stated clearly, the ways and means for accomplishment are at hand. There remains only one thing, the all important choice of method.

The only practicable medium through which to attack the problem is microphotography. (Whether the ultimate desideratum is microfilm or microprint is a secondary matter.) The technique of microphotography has already progressed to the point where we may, with complete realism, look forward to a national, a hemispheric, a global network of microfilming facilities. As stated by Mr. Lacy last year, the bases of effective cooperative effort in the field of microphotography are these:<sup>8</sup> (1) A set of commonly accepted technical standards; (2) a clearing house of information concerning

major projects; (3) a planning committee to evaluate the need for microphotocopying materials and to afford a medium through which libraries would divide the spheres of responsibility; (4) arrangements for making available to other libraries the results of major projects; (5) acceptance of the principle of interlibrary loan as applicable to microfilms. To these criteria we should probably add a sixth; namely, the effective establishment of an international network of microphotographing enterprises.

#### *Current Plans, Extension of Policy*

Last year Mr. Lacy announced some active plans, some projected plans.<sup>9</sup> In the field of domestic operations, the Library of Congress continues its project to film great metropolitan daily newspapers the files of which are in danger of deterioration or actual disintegration because they were printed on wood pulp paper. The projected plan to acquire out-of-print books and serials in microfilm form as a substitute for the expensive search-and-purchase of these desiderata has not yet been adopted.

In the general field of acquisitions through microfilming, it has been stated that the Library of Congress has an obvious responsibility: (1) to microfilm abroad unpublished materials which relate to the national history of the United States; (2) to microfilm legal materials, whether printed or manuscript, of which no copies exist in the United States.<sup>10</sup> It may also be added that the Library of Congress is eager to exploit fortuitous opportunities to microfilm *in extenso* large bodies of cultural materials not hitherto available or likely long to remain available. Examples to the point are the current projects for the microphotographing of records in the Japanese Foreign Office, and of a large number of manuscripts at Jerusalem and Mt. Sinai invaluable for the

<sup>6</sup> Evans, *loc. cit.*, p.3.

<sup>7</sup> Evans, *loc. cit.*, p.4.

<sup>8</sup> Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.9-12.

<sup>9</sup> Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.13 and 16.

<sup>10</sup> Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p.13.

pursuit of research in Biblical exegesis and the history of art.

The Library of Congress recognizes its responsibility to assist in the performance of such major tasks in the general interest of American scholarship and the better understanding between nations. This point begs a very serious question: Albeit the Library of Congress recognizes this responsibility, and in the cases just cited has acted promptly, how could the Library of Congress have achieved communal advice, how could the Library of Congress have achieved speedy cooperative action under existing conditions? It is therefore believed essential that there be created at the earliest opportunity an advisory committee on the co-operative planning of extensive microfilm projects which will be representative of the interests inherent in the philosophies of research libraries, professional associations and composite groups devoted to the advancement of human knowledge. Without such a committee even the best intended and most meticulously executed plans will always be subject to the possible criticism that they do not reflect the national thinking, that they do not represent most effectively the national interests.

But to return to the story of the Library of Congress and its announced plans. It has likewise been stated<sup>11</sup> that the Library of Congress should try to aid in the establishment, at one or more centers in each of the major countries of the world, of microfilming facilities adequate to serve the needs of American institutions and American scholarship. The degree of aid, the nature of the aid will necessarily vary from country to country. In some it will largely be stimulus to a broader point of view, in others it will necessarily be the physical importation of equipment, the training of operators, the complete operation, at least at

first, of these outposts of aids to scholarship.

The next point relates to the scope of any independent or cooperative large scale microfilming project. While magnificent work was done by individuals and by institutions to make safe against modern war the cultural heritage, much has been lost. While conscientious and often spectacular work was done by the officers and men of the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives units in the field, combat is no environment in which to safeguard or rescue cultural materials. What then? The War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials in Britain, as described by Dr. W. J. Wilson, "while designed incidentally to serve American scholars, was thought of from the start as an attempt to rescue from possible destruction certain of the literary treasures of England."<sup>12</sup> The plan had been much broader in its inception; namely, to photocopy the basic cultural treasures of a documentary nature in all Western Europe. The outbreak of active combat on the Continent forced the limitation of the plan to Britain. Whether it would have been practicable no one can say. Even a selective list of manuscripts and rare printed items required much time to film.

A far more ambitious program has been planned by the Committee on Documentary Reproduction of the American Historical Association, as you know, through the medium of its numerous subcommittees, each of which is responsible for the plans relating to a specific country. The fulfilment of the plans of all these subcommittees would result in the availability in the United States of entire series of the most important cultural source materials of all the accessible countries of the world. The cost of such a program is staggering, even in a world accustomed to 10-figure budgets. The Finnish Committee of the A.H.A., for example,

<sup>11</sup> Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>12</sup> Wilson, W. J. "Manuscripts in Microfilm." *Library Quarterly*, 13:218, July 1943.

estimates at least one year's work with a two-camera team for this comparatively small archival source. In France, on the other hand, there are at least 26 classes in the Archives de France, each of which would probably require the services of a two-camera team for one year. And remember this estimate disregards all libraries in Paris, and repositories of all types elsewhere in France.<sup>13</sup> To the basic cost of such a filming project must be added the cost of processing, editing, and servicing the completed rolls of films.

Other groups which are grappling with the same gigantic problem are less sanguine of accomplishment on so grandiose a scale. For example, the Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies reported just one year ago:

The destruction of libraries and archives in Europe during the last war has taught us a sad lesson. It is the duty of responsible scholarly organizations to help protect the irreplaceable materials in such collections against the hazards of the future. A complete microfilming of entire collections of records or of manuscript books is not feasible on account of the extent of the European collections, for it would entail not only a very large expenditure on the making of the microfilms but an even larger one on their cataloging and administration. It is important to select those pieces which are really important and irreplaceable. Such a selection requires time, much preliminary information, and the expert knowledge of many scholars in different fields. . . . The preliminary information needed consists primarily of catalogs of the manuscript collections, preferably printed catalogs. . . . As an interim solution, the handwritten inventories preserved on the spot should be microfilmed and thus made accessible to scholars, preferably in the Library of Congress.<sup>14</sup>

The authors of the report, William A. Jackson and Paul O. Kristeller, then go on

to say that "although present circumstances suggest that much of the initiative and funds should come from this country, co-operation with European governments, institutions, libraries and scholars should be emphasized and would be mutually advantageous. European countries should be encouraged to develop their own microfilm deposits, in addition to the ones built up in this country. In this way, the plan will not present itself as an act of interference on the part of American scholars, but as a kind of Marshall plan in the world of scholarship."<sup>15</sup>

Coincidentally with the announcement of the above report Mr. Lacy announced that the Library of Congress believed its most useful contribution toward a solution of this great dilemma would be to undertake to microfilm such unpublished (or inaccessible published) bibliographies, guides, inventories, calendars and other finding aids.<sup>16</sup> In this past calendar year the Library of Congress has already taken several constructive steps toward the fulfilment of this self-imposed responsibility. As is coming to be appreciated more fully, even the limited objective of establishing facilities for satisfactory operations, and of securing and promulgating the knowledge of the materials which exist is a task of no small compass.

In May 1949, after a period of preliminary negotiations carried on by correspondence, the Library of Congress sent two representatives to Italy to carry on personal negotiations in that country. These representatives were accorded a friendly personal reception wherever they went—the Vatican Library, the Vatican Archives, the private archives of Prince Doria Pamphili, the Archives of the State in Rome, and the central office of the state library system. In many of these places there was a gratifying grasp of the importance of the project, and an expressed desire to see it furthered. It

<sup>13</sup> These estimates are based upon studies made by the A.H.A. Sub-Committee for Finland and for France.

<sup>14</sup> Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, conclusions, dated Jan. 17, 1949. 2p., mimeographed.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Lacy, *loc. cit.*, p. 15.

was, however, necessary to present the proposal in formal terms to the Italian government through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This formal presentation laid great stress upon the mutual benefits to be derived from the proposal. Again, you see, cooperation is at the core of the project. Inasmuch as this proposal was conceived of as a pilot project, it may not be without interest to quote the opening paragraphs here.

In the interest of historical research and scholarship not only in the United States but also in the entire civilized world the Library of Congress proposes to the Italian Government a project, which could be operated under the guidance of the appropriate agency of the Italian Government, for microfilming the significant source materials, largely unpublished, which are in the archives and libraries of Italy. If this broad proposal is acceptable to the Italian Government it is intended to develop the project in Italy as a pilot project on the basis of which similar broad proposals may subsequently be made to other governments. The Library of Congress has thus far restricted its microfilming activities in other countries largely to reproduction of materials bearing on the history of the United States.

The proposed plan contains many features which should prove advantageous to both governments. From the point of view of the United States the proposed project would serve three purposes: (1) It would increase the bibliographic resources of the Library of Congress; (2) it would enable individual scholars to select with precision particular manuscripts, documents and rare books which they require; and (3) it would establish a medium in Italy through which the Library of Congress might obtain microfilms of required items under favorable local auspices. The advantages of these points to scholarship in the Western Hemisphere in general can hardly be exaggerated.

The advantages to the Italian Government from the approval and successful implementation of the proposed project would certainly include those enumerated herewith: (1) International good will; (2) a second depository, located in another hemisphere, for the important records of the Italian cultural heritage as protection against total loss; (3) an assured

source from which microfilm or paper copies subsequently may be procured to replace in regular use original material endangered or damaged by excessive handling or normal deterioration; (4) increased knowledge throughout the civilized world of Italian historical and cultural source materials; (5) a firm basis for the Italian archives and libraries to initiate requests for exchange or microfilming of materials relating to Italian history which are located outside Italy; (6) demonstrated leadership in the present efforts (e.g., those being made by Unesco) to liberalize the understanding between nations and therefore of providing a firm basis for a lasting peace.

The Italian government referred the proposal to the Superior Council in the appropriate ministries. Because the summer months intervened the matter was first put on the agenda for September at which time, in the Ministry for Public Instruction, it was referred to a committee which was instructed to report in December. At this time I do not have that report. The Library of Congress, however, has not allowed itself to become discouraged by these delays. It believes that the experience so far gained will be invaluable for the future, and it is convinced that by appealing to the spirit of cooperation it has tapped a wellspring of international good will which will do much to relieve the odium attached to American wealth of resources.

The second step forward taken by the Library of Congress during the past year was to create on the staff the position of Special Assistant on Microfilm Program, and to place that position in the Office of the Assistant Director for Acquisitions in the Processing Department. The basic responsibility of the incumbent of this position is to plan for the photoreproduction of materials for addition to the collections of the Library of Congress. He is concerned with the professional, as opposed to the technical, aspects of the execution of projects. He will represent the Library of Congress in dealing with other libraries, foundations, and similar

institutions with respect to the establishment and execution of photoreproduction projects. Of necessity, a large proportion of his time will be spent outside the continental limits of the United States. The headquarters for foreign activities probably will be located in Paris. The exact address will be announced later.

An important feature of the program will be the accumulation of information regarding foreign depositories, their unpublished bibliographical tools, and photoreproduction equipment existing abroad. The Library of Congress will endeavor to develop the means of aiding American scholars and other American institutions in obtaining photoreproductions of materials abroad through the medium of the information detailed just above; by aiding in the negotiation of permissions to film; by aiding in the establishment of services supplementary to those already (inadequately) existing abroad; and, within the limits of its resources, by any related means which contributes to the wider dissemination of knowledge. The Library of Congress will develop standard practices for the editorial and bibliographical aspects of photoreproduction, particularly as regards archival and other manuscript material, and will prepare statements of procedures for publication.

In addition, the Library of Congress plans to publish sales catalogs for the materials microfilmed under this expanded program so that interested individuals or institutions may know what has been made available and may be enabled to order positive microfilm copies for their use. Information on projects in progress, on recent acquisitions of microfilm received but not yet ready for service, and general news in connection with these activities will be reported from time to time in such obvious media as the *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* or *Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*. In order that this goal of expeditious processing

of information and of microfilm may be achieved, the Library of Congress plans to allocate to this task the full time services of an editorial assistant who will work in close liaison with the Chief of the Photoduplication Service and with the Special Assistant on Microfilm Program.

#### *Résumé of Photo Activities*<sup>17</sup>

As early as 1905 the Library of Congress had arranged for the hand-copying abroad of documents relating to the history of the United States. Occasional photographic reproductions were made, usually by privately owned camera. About 1910 the use of the photostat was introduced. Between 1905 and 1927 some 300,000 folios had been copied by one means or another. In 1927 Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. granted funds which eventually totaled \$490,000 and which were expended over a period of seven years. During that time the Library of Congress acquired through this means more than 2,500,000 pages of manuscripts. In 1925 the Library of Congress had received an endowment from James B. Wilbur the income from which was to be expended continuously for the acquisition of materials abroad relating to American history. In 1923 the Modern Language Association undertook to secure for American scholars individual items by photoreproduction outside the United States. The Library of Congress received these on deposit and provided the servicing of the collection.

The activities of the War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials have already been mentioned in passing. In 1942 the work came to a temporary stop, but since 1947 the unfinished work has been resumed. Since the end of the war filming of source materials on American history has also been resumed in England, France and Spain. In November 1948 the

<sup>17</sup> This section is based upon data assembled, but not published, by Mrs. Marlene Wright of the Library of Congress.

Library of Congress assumed responsibility for the management and operations of the microfilm laboratory of the Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City which is filming for the Library of Congress, and any other American institutions which place orders, materials relating to the United States.

The most recent development is that which has already been mentioned in passing; namely, the decision on the part of the Library of Congress to further the dissemination of knowledge by cooperating in the filming of specific bodies of materials when unique opportunities present themselves to film materials of extraordinary value or importance. The projects currently in progress at Jerusalem and Mt. Sinai have already been mentioned. So has the project of filming for the Department of State the records of the Japanese Foreign Office. At the same time, the Library of Congress is securing microfilm copies of numerous serials available in the library of the National Diet of Japan. Closely associated with this enlarged point of view is the sub-publishing of certain materials which would not otherwise be generally available. An example of this from the foreign field is the recent collection on microfilm of all the prime editions of Ronsard to which will be added, in the film, critical notes prepared by an American scholar.

From the domestic field we may cite the project which was started in 1941 under the joint sponsorship of the Library of Congress and the University of North Carolina and which has been carried out under direction of William S. Jenkins. Its purpose is to assemble and organize systematically, for the early period, the statutory, constitutional, executive, administrative, judicial, and legislative records of all the colonies, territories and states. Editorial annotations are a part of the film. At the present time the project has resulted in

1,200 rolls of film 100 feet in length containing approximately 1,440,000 exposures and 2,880,000 pages of text.<sup>18</sup> Also from the domestic field we may cite the current project to microfilm for purpose of preservation important American newspapers, and for that reason as well as for reasons of general research, the project to microfilm, in cooperation with the Committee on Negro Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, early Negro newspapers.

Because of its significance, it should be noted again that the Library of Congress has established in the Union Catalog Division a clearing house for information regarding extensive microfilm projects which relate to newspapers, serials, and manuscript collections. The purpose of this clearing house has been to bring together in one place data from scattered sources on microfilming projects which are being considered, which are in progress, and which have been completed. The ultimate in service will be achieved when this clearing house can also provide information on all materials currently available through photoreproduction in this country.

#### *Literature on Microfilming*<sup>19</sup>

This brief section is presented with some hesitancy lest its nature be misunderstood. It is, to state the obvious, no attempt to give a critical evaluation of the existing literature on the manifold problems posed by the preservation of library materials on microfilm. It is rather an attempt to indicate how muddled are the waters, and to suggest explicitly and implicitly the need for such a critical evaluation.

Even a cursory examination of the 77 titles listed in the most recent bibliography,

<sup>18</sup> Jenkins, William S. "Records of the States of the United States." *Library of Congress Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*, 6:3-7, May 1949.

<sup>19</sup> This section and the following section were omitted in the oral presentation of the paper so as to keep the time required for presentation within the proper limits.

"Microfilm and Microcards: Their Use in Research. A Selected List of Recent References,"<sup>20</sup> reveals the continued struggle with the new medium. It reveals the attempt to compile bibliographies based on the medium rather than on the materials filmed; to explain new equipment; to establish the legal status of materials which appear in the form of microfilm; to prepare subject lists of materials available; to process and service the acquisitions in film form. It also contains much on the philosophy of the new mechanized aids to research scholarship. Other matters are those of union cataloging, already mentioned; the question whether or not film should or can be cataloged; the special problems posed by the fact that most of the materials which constitute the text on the frames of microfilms is manuscript; the uncertainty of form: roll film, flat film, microcard, microprint.

The speed of mechanical progress in this century leaves the scholar and the librarian, as well as the layman, somewhat breathless. For that reason, the fundamental papers on microphotography which were presented only a little more than a decade ago<sup>21</sup> already seem as outmoded as do early motion pictures when compared with the technically perfected contemporary examples. While the *Manual*<sup>22</sup> of Binkley will always be the classic in this field, so much has happened since its publication that one must supplement its fact-finding pages with references to periodical literature,<sup>23</sup> and its visionary pages with such papers as Tate's.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Library of Congress, General Reference and Bibliography Division, Nov. 29, 1949. 9p. Typed. A revised and enlarged edition is now being prepared.

<sup>21</sup> Raney, M. Llewellyn, ed. *Microphotography for Libraries: Papers Presented at the Microphotography Symposium at the 1936 Conference of the American Library Association*. Chicago, A.L.A. 1936. xi, 138p. Igem, *Microphotography for Libraries*, 1937. . . . Chicago, A.L.A., 1937. ix, 80p.

<sup>22</sup> Binkley, Robert C. *Manual on Methods of Reproducing Research Materials: A Survey Made for the Joint Committee on Materials for Research of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies*. Ann Arbor, Edwards Brothers, 1936. iv, 207p.

<sup>23</sup> For example, Daniel F. Noll. "From the Microphotographer's Mail." *American Archivist*, 11:238-45, July 1948.

It may not be amiss, however, to quote a few passages from the first chapter of the *Binkley Manual*, "The Setting of the Problem of Reproducing Research Materials."

In dealing with the problem of research materials, three interests are to be distinguished: those of the scholar as a producer, of the scholar as a consumer, and of the library as a custodian. The scholar as a producer wants to see his manuscript set up in type, printed on good paper, bound in buckram, and distributed in as large an edition as possible. . . . The consumer interest is that of the man who is using a library. All the documents of which he makes use are for him "materials for research." He does not care whether they are printed or typewritten, or in manuscript form, whether durable or perishable, whether original or photostat, so long as they are legible. . . . The custodian's interest has to do with the demands of future generations of scholars. The growth of each library must be so directed that its present acquisitions dovetail with past and future acquisitions. The custodian must also undertake to gather items for which there is no present demand on the part of the "consumer;" he may seek especially to care for the unique things which are nowhere else collected and preserved. . . .

In the distribution of books, that is to say, in the formulating of library acquisition policies, the consumer and custodian interests clash. . . . In the attempt to meet the need, library funds are turned this way and that, regardless of long-term policies, to supply the research requirements of the man who happens to be on the ground. But this interferes with the distribution of fields among libraries, which is necessary if the total resources of scholarship are to be used most efficiently in collecting and preserving materials.

An inquiry into the techniques of reproducing research materials is called for at the present time because there are coming to light new processes and devices which, taken in their entirety, promise to have an impact on the intellectual world comparable with that of the invention of printing. . . . A few more inventions along the present line of technological development may result in rendering "reprinting" a kind of simple addition to the func-

<sup>24</sup> Tate, Vernon D. "From Binkley to Bush." *American Archivist*, 10:249-57, July 1947.

tions of a library, as photostating has come to be.<sup>25</sup>

Only 10 years later it could be said that "the photostat and a number of other devices for full-size reproduction of library materials will undoubtedly continue to be used for some purposes in the future. They do not, however, offer the great economies in production of extremely small editions and in storage space that are presented by microfilm; neither do they raise the problems involved in library handling of a medium that requires reading machines for its use. . . . Microfilm and microprint [are] methods of reproduction that seem to have the greatest possibilities for further development."<sup>26</sup>

In 1942 Dr. W. J. Wilson, who is now chief, History of Medicine Division, Army Medical Library, prepared for the American Council of Learned Societies a report "the motive of which was to furnish a factual and logical groundwork for administrative decision." This report analyzed what had been done with the films received at the Library of Congress from the War Emergency Program for Microcopying Research Materials in Britain, what had been done at the Library of Congress in handling similar projects, and what had been done there and elsewhere with respect to the basic problem of cataloging manuscripts. It also attempted some analysis of the principles of such cataloging. The report likewise discussed the classification, numbering, and storage of microfilm. The materials of this report, except for the sections last mentioned, have been published in two articles.<sup>27</sup> Even after a lapse of seven years this probably is still the best general analysis of the problems.

<sup>25</sup> Binkley, *op. cit.*, p. 1 and 2.

<sup>26</sup> Williams, Edwin E. and Noble, Ruth V. *Preliminary Memoranda . . . for the Conference to Discuss International Cultural, Educational, and Scientific Exchanges*, Princeton University, 25-26 November, 1946. Sponsored by the International Relations Board and the Board on Resources of the American Library Association, Cambridge, Mass., 1946. 195p. Mimeographed. The passage quoted is from Chapter IV, "Photographic Reproduction," p.43.

### *Microfilm Facilities Abroad*

This last brief section, like that which immediately precedes it, serves primarily a negative function. In spite of the excellent facilities which are available at a very few large centers such as London and Paris, and the temporary excellent (U.S.) facilities in Mexico City, apparently the best generalization that can be made about microfilm facilities throughout the world is that they do not compare favorably with those in the United States either in geographical distribution, quality of equipment, efficiency of operation, and pricing.<sup>28</sup> But it must be remarked at once that detailed information on facilities in the many countries of Europe, Central and South America, not to mention the Near East and Asia, Africa, and the Pacific areas is either very fragmentary to date or nonexistent. A list is being prepared by the Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureau for Great Britain, a list is already available for the Netherlands, and, so I am told, the International Federation of Documentation is about to undertake the preparation of a general list. Whether or not this list proves to be inclusive or selective, the Library of Congress will be in a position to annotate it from time to time as the result of its foreign program.

From this brief summary of the policies already announced, of the plans and extended policies just announced, from the illustrative example of problems ahead, and from the statement of work already done I hope that I have presented a telescopic view of the field of microfilming projects as seen by the Library of Congress.

<sup>27</sup> Wilson, W. J. "Manuscripts in Microfilm." *Library Quarterly*, 13:212-26, July 1943; *ibid.*, 13:293-309, October 1943.

<sup>28</sup> Prewar information, based upon first-hand acquaintance with microfilming facilities in the large libraries of Europe in the period 1934-1940, is summarized in the article of Adele Kibre, "Microphotography in European Libraries." *Journal of Documentary Reproduction*, 4:158-63, September 1941.

## Library Building Construction Among Colleges and Universities, 1950

*Dr. Muller is director, University Libraries, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and chairman, A.C.R.L. Committee on College and University Library Buildings.*

HERE are two typical recent inquiries addressed to the A.C.R.L. Committee of College and University Library Buildings:

(Mar. 15, 1950)—I am writing—to inquire if you have a record of colleges and small universities which have recently built new buildings with modular plans. If there are any such libraries in our area, we might visit them, or at least make inquiries as to their plans and the success of them—

\* \* \* \*

(Dec. 10, 1949)—What I should like to have is a list of buildings which have been completed or planned within the past year or two, with figures on total book capacity and seating capacity.

Such inquiries have come from all parts of the country as well as from overseas. To supply the requested information, a questionnaire survey of institutions listed in *American Universities and Colleges* (American Council on Education, 1948, 5th ed., edited by A. J. Brumbaugh) was conducted in the fall of 1949. It is planned to publish the data that have been collected in several instalments, of which this article is the first one. The tabulations presented here give statistics on college and university library buildings that were under construction at the end of 1949 or for which contract drawings have been completed. Tabulations sub-

sequently to be published will list (1) library buildings completed between 1929 and 1949 and (2) institutions that expect to construct new library buildings in the near future.

It should be noted that the tabulations cover only those institutions that returned questionnaires. Information on buildings of institutions that failed to return questionnaires might be obtained from various other sources, such as back files of the *Library Journal*, *College and Research Libraries*, and the *Proceedings* of the (Cooperative) Committee on College and University Library Building Plans, of which Ralph Ellsworth, director of libraries, State University of Iowa, has been chairman during 1949-50.

The tabulations should prove useful to librarians, architects, and college authorities in making the budget and size estimates for library building construction and equipment. Since the size of the 24 institutions vary within a wide range, it should not be too difficult to locate an institution that resembles the one for which a new library building is to be planned. Any library building should, of course, be designed with due regard to the special conditions existing on a particular campus, such as the anticipated rate of growth in enrolment and book collections, the nature of the curriculum, degree of centralization desired, climate, prevailing architectural style, and the availability of funds.

### Rank Order

In the accompanying tabulation, the insti-

College and University Library Buildings Under Construction and Buildings for Which Contract Drawings Have Been Completed  
January 1950  
(Arranged in the Order of Estimated Total Floor Area)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Name of Institution	Minimum No. of Volumes Planned for	Minimum No. of Seats Provided	Estimated Cost in dollars (including equipment)	Enroll- ment 1948 <sup>b</sup>	Total No. of Volumes in Library System <sup>c</sup>	No. of Vols. in Old Main Bldg., Dec. 48	Notes (x denotes "under construction")
State U. of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.	1,000,000	2,500	1,580,000	10,550	589,114	150,000	x (modular) Completed Jan. '50 (modular)
Wash. State Coll., Pullman, Wash.	1,500,000	2,200	3,000,000	6,530	610,000	600,000	
St. Louis U., St. Louis, Mo.	1,000,000	1,500	1,500,000	10,015	439,741	200,000	
U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.	1,200,000	2,000	5,900,000	22,353	687,500	700,000 <sup>d</sup>	x
U. of Mississippi, University, Miss.	450,000	1,250	1,250,000	3,320	121,782	139,041	x
Queens Coll., Flushing, N.Y.	300,000	1,333	2,800,000	2,915	67,348	?	
Miss. St. Coll., State Coll., Miss.	350,000	850	950,000	3,571	80,696	?	x
Woman's Coll., U. of N.C., Greensboro, N.C.	300,000	1,000	1,150,000	2,120	123,361	130,000	Completed April '50
Mass. Inst. of Tech., Cambridge, Mass.	350,000	500	3,500,000	5,393	405,444	300,000	Completed Jan. '50
U. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	300,000	700	500,000 <sup>e</sup>	8,598	114,632	?	
Eastern Ill. St. T. Coll., Charleston, Ill.	175,000	750	2,000,000	1,423	66,144	66,000	Completed Mar. '50
Northern Ill. St. T. Coll., DeKalb, Ill.	175,000	750	2,100,000	2,068	64,925	72,000	Contract let in '49
Loyola U., New Orleans, La.	250,000	515	850,000	3,099	80,628	80,000	x (modular)
North Dakota Agric. Coll., Fargo, N.D.	200,000	560	500,000	2,397	60,659	88,000	x
West Virginia St. Coll., Institute, W.Va.	178,000	500	500,000 <sup>f</sup>	1,542	31,351	33,242	x
North Carolina Coll., Durham, N.C.	200,000	400	725,000	972	33,212	36,461	x
Bradley U., Peoria, Ill.	150,000	500	600,000	3,637	62,872	72,000	Completed Summer '50 (modular)
Mount Union Coll., Alliance, Ohio	200,000	338	580,000	1,002	75,000	?	x
Rollins Coll., Winter Park, Fla.	160,000	300	500,000	630	80,000	40,000	x
Mills Coll., Oakland, Calif.	165,000	200 <sup>g</sup>	400,000	657	102,589	108,659	
Ouachita Coll., Arkadelphia, Ark.	65,000	450	125,000	818	23,973	30,000	Completed: Summer '50
Converse Coll., Spartanburg, S.C.	87,000	300	230,000	383	36,500	38,500	x
Taylor U., Upland, Ind.	65,000	250	160,000	535	22,500	?	
Fairmont St. Coll., Fairmont, W.Va.	64,000	250	400,000	1,167	33,300	33,300	

<sup>a</sup> Cost of first unit only

<sup>b</sup> U. S. Office of Education, *Educational Directory: Higher Education, 1949-50* (Part III)

<sup>c</sup> American Library Directory, 1948 (Bowker, 1948)

<sup>d</sup> Excludes newspapers, pamphlets, manuscripts

<sup>e</sup> Excludes 75 cents

tutions are arranged in the rank order of estimated total floor area. Since data on total building size were not uniformly available for all institutions, estimates had to be made on the basis of proposed capacity for volumes plus number of seats, allowing 25 square feet per reader, 1 square foot per 15 volumes, and 40 per cent of the entire building for mechanical equipment, main stairways, elevators, office space, main corridors, auditorium, and other spaces not directly used for the accommodation of books and readers. (Stack desks were considered to be part of the available floor area; no attention was paid to the cubage of the buildings.)

#### *Cost*

Column 4 reveals wide variations in cost. It is not fair to make rigid unit cost comparison until it is known what features are expected to be included in each building, such as air conditioning, an auditorium, audiovisual facilities, faculty offices, and class rooms. The manner in which the contract is let, the architectural style, and the degree of lavishness in furnishings also affect the unit cost. The cost of the building of M.I.T., which appears to be disproportionately high, may be explained by the provision of unusually ample faculty offices, conference rooms, and exhibit areas. Other buildings that are expected to be above average in cost are those of two Illinois state teachers colleges, Queens College, and the University of Wisconsin. Low-cost buildings appear to be those of the University of Iowa, St. Louis University, Ouachita College and Taylor University, unless the quotations of cost represent serious underestimates.

#### *Modular Design*

Column 8 shows that only four of the 24 buildings seem to follow modular design; and only one of them (North Dakota Agricultural College) uses hollow supporting columns as ventilation ducts, following the

pioneer, Hardin-Simmons University, which completed its modular library and administration building in 1949.

#### *Seating Capacity*

Wide variations in seating capacity as related to enrolment is revealed by comparing columns 3 and 5. Some colleges expect to provide seats for over 60 per cent or more of the total current student body (Converse College, Ouachita College, Taylor University), possibly in anticipation of future increases in enrolment. Others provide for less than 15 per cent (Bradley University, M.I.T., University of Miami, University of Wisconsin), either because enrolment is eventually expected to drop or because of the existence of many departmental libraries.

#### *Volume Capacity*

All but one of the institutions provide for a volume capacity larger than that of their present main building (if they have one). The one exception is M.I.T., where the present main building apparently houses departmental collections that will not be transferred to the new building. Some colleges provide book storage areas for over three times their present holdings (North Carolina College, West Virginia State College, Mississippi State College, Queens College, University of Mississippi), reflecting an accelerated acquisitions program or an effort to bring scattered departmental collections into a central location. Where the new building provides for less than double present total holdings, the library system is expected to continue to be departmentalized (State University of Iowa, Wisconsin) or the college sets a definite limit on the total number of volumes to be made available to its undergraduates (Mills College). Anticipation of the establishment of central storage libraries, such as the Midwest Inter-Library Center, may also have had an influence on the size of book storage facilities in library plans.

# A Brief of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Directors, A.C.R.L., Chicago

Meeting Jan. 27, 1950.

President Wyllis E. Wright, in calling the meeting to order, welcomed the A.C.R.L. representatives on the A.L.A. Council, committee chairmen, and other invited guests.

Ralph Parker reported on the progress the Committee on Budgets, Compensation, and Schemes of Service is making in preparing a classification and pay plan for professional schools. He stated the work was extremely complicated and little real progress had been made in the past two years. The Committee to Study Library Standards of Professional Schools, of which he is chairman, has made some small progress in promoting revision of accrediting procedures by the Society of American Forestry Schools.

Frank Lundy recommended that further study of the problem of the financial needs of the association be turned back to the officers and directors of the association and that the Committee on Financial Needs be dismissed. There followed considerable discussion of the present 20 per cent allotment of membership dues to the divisional treasury, and the desirability of asking for more for A.C.R.L. Mr. Hamlin reported current support for A.C.R.L. (budget for the A.C.R.L. office plus divisional allotment) was somewhat over 50 per cent of the total dues paid to A.L.A. by A.C.R.L. members. Much was said in favor of having A.C.R.L. collect its own dues and control its own funds, making generous allotments to A.L.A. Under such arrangements it would be in a better position to discharge its obligations to its membership. A motion to discharge the Committee on Financial Needs with thanks was passed.

The desirability of free subscriptions to *College and Research Libraries* in place of the *A.L.A. Bulletin* was discussed. President Wright reported this matter had not been dropped by the wayside and reported on the cost of the proposal.

The board next discussed the "Policy State-

ment" prepared early in 1949. This proposed that A.C.R.L. should have the right to admit members without respect to membership in another organization, that the association should collect and control membership dues, and that it should allot funds annually to the support of A.L.A. Headquarters. The statement opposed the organizational parts of the Fourth Activities Committee Report (Part II) and recommended cooperative exploration of plans for a federation of autonomous American library associations.<sup>1</sup> The statement had previously been approved by the board for submission to the regional conferences, where it had been likewise approved, virtually unchanged, at all except those held at Vancouver and Fort Worth. Opposition to the organizational parts of the Fourth Activities Committee Report had been unanimous. Mr. Wright suggested that there may have been misunderstanding of the recommendation regarding federation. The committee which prepared the "Policy Statement" merely recommended that A.C.R.L. should cooperate with other divisions of A.L.A. in studying plans for an improved A.L.A. through federation. The A.C.R.L. Board passed a motion that the "Policy Statement" be submitted to the A.C.R.L. General Session on the following day.

The executive secretary reported briefly on the work of his office and asked advice on keeping in touch with the membership. He requested assistance in handling a large accumulation of archives stored in the office. The board passed a motion authorizing the president of A.C.R.L. to appoint a local committee to review A.C.R.L. archives.

In a discussion of the term of office of the executive secretary of A.C.R.L. it was the general feeling of the board that a term of three to five years was normally desirable.

In regard to the location of the Midwinter

<sup>1</sup>"A Statement on Relationship of A.C.R.L. and A.L.A." *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 43:310-311, October 1949.

# A.C.R.L. Budget for 1949-50, as Amended and Approved Jan. 29, 1950

## Probable Income

From membership dues ..... \$5,500.00

## Proposed Expenditures

College and Research Libraries annual subvention ..... \$1,500.00

## Section expenses:

Agricultural Libraries Section .....	50.00
College Libraries Section .....	75.00
Engineering School Libraries Section .....	50.00
Junior College Libraries Section .....	300.00
Reference Librarians Section .....	85.00
Libraries of Teacher Training Institutions Section .....	75.00
University Libraries Section .....	125.00

## Committee expenses:

Budgets, Compensation, and Schemes of Service .....	100.00
College and University Library Buildings .....	100.00
Financing <i>College and Research Libraries</i> .....	100.00
Periodicals Exchange Union .....	25.00
Preparation and Qualification for Librarianship .....	175.00
Publications .....	50.00
Study Materials for Instruction in the Use of the Library .....	25.00
Policy .....	no funds needed
Constitution and By-Laws .....	no funds needed
Membership .....	150.00
Recruiting .....	175.00
Statistics .....	100.00

Addressograph Plates for the Office of the Executive Secretary ..... 125.00

Moving Expenses of present Executive Secretary ..... 483.00

Support of A.L.A. Washington Office ..... 400.00

## Officers' Expenses:

President .....	25.00
Treasurer .....	10.00
General Administrative Expenses, Travel, etc. ....	700.00
A.C.R.L.'s share of the T.I.A.A. premiums for Executive Secretary (A.C.R.L. pays \$25.00 and the Executive Secretary \$25.00 per month) .....	300.00

\$5,303.00

meetings it was agreed that a downtown hotel was desirable. The executive secretary was requested to convey to A.L.A. Headquarters the feeling of the group on this subject.

\* \* \* \*

Meeting Jan. 29, 1950.

After calling the meeting to order, Mr. Wright brought up for discussion the provisional arrangement which provided for the A.C.R.L. Executive Office on the A.L.A. budget instead of previous practice of a separate and distinct budget for this office. The arrangement had been accepted provisionally by the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors

in the spring of 1949. Mr. Hamlin felt too inexperienced to express positive opinion for or against and suggested it be continued as a working arrangement until the Cleveland Conference. The plan was criticized as unbusinesslike by both Mr. Hamlin and Mr. Rush, who stressed the difficulty of responsibility to two different sources of funds. The latter felt that it was highly desirable for A.C.R.L. to have as complete as possible control over the budget of its executive office. It was agreed to leave this as a tentative arrangement until the time of the Cleveland Conference.

The Board voted that A.C.R.L. suggest to the member bodies of the Joint Importations Committee that this committee be dissolved.

The Board approved the budget as shown in the table.

The item of \$300 for the Junior College Libraries Section was approved in view of the expense of preparation of the booklist for junior college libraries upon which the section has already expended much labor. The subvention to *College and Research Libraries* covered the deficit of \$290 in the *College and Research Libraries* budget at the end of the fiscal year 1948-49, the cost of the anniversary issue in October 1949 which was double the usual size of the journal, and the cost of

publishing the 10-year index to the journal.

A motion was passed to continue the 85 gift subscriptions to *College and Research Libraries* for a second year. These go to foreign libraries where difficulties in dollar exchange are such that they cannot secure it with their own funds.

The board passed a motion approving a contract with University Microfilms whereby it will be possible for libraries to keep *College and Research Libraries* in microfilm instead of bound volume form if they wish to do so. No loss in subscriptions is expected to result from this arrangement.—Arthur T. Hamlin, Executive Secretary.

## Plans Completed for the Midwest Inter-Library Center Building

At a recent meeting of the board of directors of the Midwest Inter-Library Corporation, final building plans were adopted. Construction is expected to begin during May, and the building should be ready for occupancy by Jan. 1, 1951.

The Center, which will provide cooperative housing in Chicago of less-used research materials for 13 middlewestern libraries, is planning six tiers of stacks covering a ground area 90 by 100 feet. A feature of the stacks is the use of a new type of compact storage hinged shelving developed by Snead & Company, in which each aisle gives access to six layers of books instead of the usual two. The outer layers of double-faced shelving swing out, each three-foot section opening like a door, supported by casters and floor and ceiling pivots.

The anticipated capacity is 2,000,000 volumes of books, and 10,000 volumes of newspapers. It is expected that much of the newspaper collection will be converted to microfilm copies.

A low, split-level wing in front of the windowless stacks structure will house workspace, shipping room, administrative offices, photoreproduction laboratory, a teletype room, and 20 study cubicles.

When the building is ready for occupancy, the Center plans to send its truck to member

libraries to pick up books and newspapers they have selected for housing in Chicago. Deposits will fall into four categories as follows: *Category A*—Outright gift—ownership relinquished. *Category B*—Title remains with depositing institution; deposit is permanent so long as the Center shall last; material subject to recall only upon dissolution of the Midwest Inter-Library Corporation. *Category C*—Title remains with depositing institution. It is expected that deposits be indefinite. *Category D*—Rental storage. Space available at annual rental.

By means of teletype, member libraries will have quick access to deposited materials. A policy has been adopted which provides for the acquisition of new materials by the Center on a share-the-cost basis.

The present members of the Midwest Inter-Library Corporation are: The University of Chicago, State University of Iowa, University of Illinois, Illinois Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, Indiana University, University of Kansas, Michigan State College, Northwestern University, Purdue University, University of Wisconsin, University of Cincinnati and the University of Notre Dame.

Ralph T. Esterquest, formerly assistant director of libraries at the University of Denver, is director of the Midwest Inter-Library Center.

# Brief of Minutes, Association of Research Libraries, Jan. 26, 1950, Chicago

THE 34TH meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held in Chicago at the Edgewater Beach Hotel on Jan. 26, 1950, beginning at 5 P.M. and continuing through dinner and the evening.

Ralph E. Ellsworth was elected a member of the Advisory Committee for a term of five years to succeed Donald Coney whose term had expired. Charles W. David was elected A.R.L. representative on the A.L.A. Council for a term of four years to succeed Paul North Rice whose term had expired.

It was decided that the next meeting of the Association of Research Libraries should be held in Cleveland in July at a date to be selected during the A.L.A. Conference week.

## *Documents Expediting Project*

The Documents Expediting Project (designed to assist libraries in obtaining documents, for the most part "processed" documents, from Washington), which is under a joint committee of which Homer Halvorson is the chairman, was the subject of considerable discussion. The executive secretary reported on an examination of the history and operation of the project which he had recently made in Washington, and James T. Babb, the A.R.L. representative on the joint committee, reported on the findings of a questionnaire which had been sent out for the purpose of determining the experience of A.R.L. members with the project and their views with respect to it. In the end the opinion prevailed that though much light had been shed upon a subject which was too little understood, nevertheless not all the essential facts relating to this matter had yet been brought out. It was accordingly voted that Mr. Halvorson be requested to submit a full report on the project from the beginning and to distribute the report well in advance of the next meeting so that members would then be in a better position to discuss the problem with knowledge and to arrive at a sound decision.

## *Farmington Plan*

Paul North Rice submitted a brief report dealing with the diminishing part which the New York Public Library has played in the operation of the Farmington Plan during the past year, due to the fact that agents of the Plan abroad have been asked to do their own classifying of Farmington Plan books and to make shipments directly to the recipient libraries in this country.

Keyes D. Metcalf, chairman of the Farmington Plan Committee, then reported on the operation of the Plan as he had observed it. He noted that there had been fewer complaints during the past year than previously, and he made reference to a convenient form which had been developed by the Acquisitions Department at Columbia University for reporting questions and errors to Farmington Plan dealers. The three main difficulties encountered in the operation of the Plan, he said, were: (1) errors of distribution, (2) errors of classification, and (3) difficulties relating to continuations—a subject which had been referred to in Farmington Plan Letter, No. 2, which had been issued in January 1950. Discussing service Mr. Metcalf observed that it had not been as rapid as it should have been, and he said that it was less satisfactory from France than from other countries, due to the fact that the Bibliothèque Nationale which is responsible for the materials sent from that country is currently very badly understaffed. He noted that the small amount of material being received currently from Belgium is not due to inefficiency in the operation of the Plan, but to the fact that publishing in Belgium is now at an unusually low ebb. Mr. Metcalf noted that funds were available to send a representative of the Farmington Plan Committee to Europe, and he said that such a visit should be made late this spring or sometime in the summer. He requested that participating libraries send reports of all their difficulties with agents

directly to him in order that it might be possible to place in the hands of our representative when he goes abroad some definite problems that require investigation.

With respect to the most fundamental question of all, namely that as to whether the Farmington Plan in its operation is giving adequate coverage, Mr. Metcalf expressed the view that a thorough study of the results achieved is needed, and he expressed the hope that Mr. Williams of Harvard would soon be able to make such a study.

Mr. Metcalf then raised a question concerning the division of fields, stating that he had come to the conviction that the operation of the Plan had been handicapped by the division of fields into too small classes. As a result it was difficult to determine who had a particular book. He also raised a question as to whether the Plan was saving money for participating libraries. With regard particularly to material in the so-called minor languages he questioned the wisdom of following logic as we had done and dividing such materials among 54 libraries. He suggested that one of the reasons for our minute division had been the desire of some libraries to prove that they were scholarly and that language presented no difficulties to them. It would have been wiser, he felt, to divide the minor language materials, which undoubtedly present peculiar difficulties, among a small number of libraries which had most need for them and which had adequate facilities for handling them. Upon motion by Mr. Ellsworth it was voted that the Farmington Plan Committee reconsider the whole question of the division of fields.

Mr. Metcalf then turned to a discussion of the extension of the Plan to additional countries, and he reviewed the contents of Farmington Plan Letter No. 2 on the question of Latin materials. Upon motion it was voted to include Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador in the Plan this year as soon as arrangements could be completed.

Mr. Metcalf then suggested that it was desirable for the association to begin the consideration of the 1951 program of the Plan, and he raised a question of including Spain, Portugal and Brazil, and he added that Lewis Hanke of the Library of Congress who was going abroad would investigate the desirability of adding these countries. He inquired whether the association would approve of in-

cluding these countries in 1951 if Mr. Hanke's investigations indicated that conditions were favorable. A question was raised as to whether it was proposed to extend the Plan to these additional countries without waiting for the report upon coverage and savings under the Plan in its earlier operations. Mr. Metcalf replied with a recommendation that a report be made to the association by Mr. Hanke upon his return from abroad, but that a final decision be reserved until the July meeting of the association. Upon motion by Mr. Clapp it was voted to request Mr. Hanke to investigate and to report not later than July 1950 on the desirability of adding these countries.

Mr. Metcalf then raised a question as to the desirability of extending the Plan to Germany and Austria. After various expressions of interest from members present, Mr. Metcalf said that he felt that a decision to extend the Plan to these countries could not be made until conditions there were such that reasonable coverage could be expected. He said that the representative of the Farmington Plan Committee who was to go abroad this spring or summer would report on this problem at least before the next midwinter meeting of the association. With respect to the extension of the Plan to Great Britain, Mr. Metcalf pointed out that guidance had been sought through a special survey of our acquisitions of British publications, and that on the basis of that survey he had recommended in Farmington Plan Letter No. 2 that Great Britain be not included since nearly adequate coverage was apparently being achieved there without the Plan.

Charles H. Brown urged that the extension of the Plan to India be seriously considered. Mr. Metcalf indicated that it had been the policy of the Committee to concentrate first on the Latin alphabet countries. He expressed the view that it might be wise to ask some competent person who might be going to India, to investigate the problem for us. It was pointed out that Mr. Poleman of the Library of Congress has recently gone to India, and Mr. Clapp said that the Library of Congress would try to have him report. Mr. Metcalf then raised the question of extending the Plan to Ireland. After a brief discussion from the floor, he expressed the view that the procedure of investigating and reporting before decision be followed with respect to all these

questionable countries before attempting a decision.

The possibility of extending the Plan to South Africa, New Zealand and Australia was then laid before the group for consideration. After a brief discussion it was decided again to follow the procedure of investigation and report before decision.

Mr. Metcalf asked for an expression of opinion as to whether the Plan should be extended to Canada. Mr. Bauer said that Canada could well be omitted since it was likely that coverage of Canadian publications was already adequate. Mr. Metcalf suggested that the problem be investigated and a report submitted at the July meeting of A.R.L., or at the next midwinter meeting at the latest.

Mr. Metcalf said that as yet there were no adequate figures on the number of books received under the Plan in 1949. He hoped that an adequate report on this subject would appear in the next Farmington Plan Letter.

In conclusion, Mr. Metcalf said that the problem of serial publications was very important and needed study. He hoped to have a study of the problem made and suggested that our agent who is to go to Europe should try to secure lists of serials from the smaller European countries.

#### *The Pest of Questionnaires*

Warner Rice discussed the pest of questionnaires from which we all suffer with increasing frequency. He began by pointing out that he was not concerned about requests for statistical information relating to the operation of his library, though he did wish that statistics could be made to appear more promptly in published form and that individuals submitting requests for information would exercise more ingenuity in locating information already available before they resorted to the method of questionnaires. His real concern, however, was with the numerous questionnaires that are submitted by various committees and by graduate students. Many of these questionnaires, he felt, were formulated without regard to sound principles of research and the studies that emerge from them often have no scholarly value and can have no scholarly value. The problem cannot be solved by our refusing to answer or by charging a fee for the work involved in answering. The problem is more fundamental than this. Mr. Rice suggested that it might be solved

if the institutions responsible for the proliferation of objectionable questionnaires would try to bring about better methods of thinking and would cultivate sounder principles of research.

Mr. Coney suggested that all questionnaires be submitted in duplicate in order to save the answering library the effort involved in making copies. Mr. Kuhlman proposed that Mr. Rice discuss the problem with the Association of American Library Schools. It was also suggested that the Association of College and Reference Libraries should review all questionnaires submitted by its various members. Mr. Hamlin, the executive secretary of that organization, who was present as a guest, pointed out that it could do so for questionnaires sponsored by A.C.R.L. headquarters and appearing under its letterhead, but that it could hardly exercise control over questionnaires submitted by various committees.

#### *Committee on Library Privileges and Fees*

Stimulated by a request from Harvard, the executive secretary had recently appointed the following Committee on Library Privileges and Fees: Keyes D. Metcalf (Harvard), chairman; Donald Coney (California); Robert A. Miller (Indiana); Carl White (Columbia); Herman Henkle (John Crerar).

Mr. Metcalf, chairman of the committee, spoke briefly of the problem created for some large research libraries by the very considerable number of visiting scholars from outside who seek to use their collections, and he said that it appeared to be necessary to consider the possibility of charging fees to these outsiders for such library privileges. He said that as yet his committee had had no opportunity to meet and make a serious beginning of his work, but he said that he was very anxious to have the problem studied and that he would appreciate receiving letters and comments from all members of the association.

#### *Use of Manuscripts by Visiting Scholars and Microfilming of Same*

Mr. Metcalf spoke of the problem of the use of manuscripts by visiting scholars and the analogous problem raised by the microfilming of manuscripts for the use of scholars at a distance. He said that it was the long standing policy of Harvard to cooperate with visiting scholars without discrimination by making its manuscripts pretty freely available

to them, but he has come to have the feeling that there are special manuscripts whose use might better be restricted to scholars of fully recognized competence and to use in connection with studies in which they would be central. He expressed the view that the whole problem needed careful consideration, and he said that it would seem to him desirable to have a code of fair practices adopted. Mr. Babb commented briefly on the experience at Yale and agreed that the problem was a serious one. He said that he had always been completely lenient in the matter of permitting visiting scholars to use manuscripts in the Yale collections, but that members of the Yale faculty had recently expressed dissatisfaction and had grown critical. He has accordingly been saddled with the responsibility of determining who is a competent scholar and may properly be permitted to use such manuscripts, but he said he felt that he was not qualified to make such a judgement and ought not to be asked to do so. Mr. Miller asked how anyone could make the decision as to who is a competent scholar, and he also inquired how any library could hope to maintain its standing as a national library if it placed limitations on the use of its materials. Mr. Babb acknowledged that Yale has had a policy of giving exclusive use of manuscripts to Yale people for a period of five years, but only if a request for exclusive use of them is made. Ralph Shaw referred to his forthcoming study of this problem and said that many rights are currently being asserted which do not exist. Mr. Clapp said that he considered a code of ethics on this subject was urgently needed. Lawrence Powell asked what purpose such a code would serve. Mr. Metcalf replied that it could be used as a guide in making decisions as to whether a manuscript should be made available to a visiting scholar or not. Mr. Powell said that in his university the faculty had control of the use of manuscripts and that he doubted whether a code drafted by librarians would be acceptable to them or indeed to any scholars. Mr. David suggested that a code developed by librarians would probably not be acceptable to scholars and suggested that a mixed committee of scholars and librarians be appointed to formulate such a code, which might then be submitted to A.R.L. for discussion and possible approval. Upon motion by Mr. Clapp it was voted that the executive secretary and the Ad-

visory Committee appoint a committee to study the problem and to draft a code of fair practice for presentation to the July meeting of the association.

Mr. Tate commented on the particular problem created by the reference use of manuscript theses. He thought that it would be desirable to study the matter of a code of fair practice especially for theses in the science and engineering fields where "primacy" or "priority" is a matter of great importance. There was disagreement as to whether this problem of manuscript theses was a part of the more general problem concerning the use of manuscripts which Mr. Metcalf had raised, or whether it was a separate problem. In the end the chairman moved that the committee which had been authorized should determine for itself whether theses should or should not be considered a part of the manuscript problem.

Mr. Miller of Indiana urged that in the make-up of the committee care should be exercised to include "have-nots" as well as "haves" in the membership.

#### *Committee on Microfilming Cooperation*

Mr. Tate, chairman of the committee, submitted a final report in which he reviewed briefly the work of the committee since its appointment nearly four years ago, and summarized its achievements. A brief digest of the report follows:

1. *Information Center on Long-Run Microfilm Projects.* Through the cooperation of the Library of Congress an Information Center on long-run microfilm projects involving newspapers, serials, or manuscripts has been established there in the Union Catalog Division. To the extent that libraries and others cooperate in listing their holdings the Information Center will be able to supply up-to-date information on projects that have been completed, are in progress, or are in prospect.

2. *Newspapers on Microfilm, A Union Check List,* compiled under the direction of George A. Schwegmann, Jr., has been published by A.R.L. in cooperation with the Library of Congress. There is already evident need for a new revised edition, and it is hoped that in connection with the work of the Information Center at the Library of Congress such a revised edition can be issued in the not too distant future.

3. *Standards for Newspaper Reproduction*

on 35mm Film. Under the direction of Herman H. Fussler and Cabot T. Stein of the University of Chicago, preliminary set of standards for the reproduction of newspapers on 35mm film has been drafted. It is to be published in the new journal, *American Documentation*, Vol. 1, No. 1.

4. *Interlibrary Loan Policy for Microfilming Reproductions.* The committee has endeavored to develop a set of basic principles governing this subject, though their adoption has been left for the voluntary action of libraries.

5. *Sale and Pricing Policies.* Though the committee has spent much time in the discussion of these matters, it has not succeeded in resolving the present chaotic sale and pricing situation.

6. *Objectives of Long-Run Periodical Filming.* The committee has felt the need of a long-range broad scale plan of microfilming both for preservation and for use, but so far it has not been able to develop such a master plan with any degree of success, and it therefore proposes to delegate this and other responsibilities to its successor agency whatever that agency may be.

Mr. Tate then expressed very strongly the view that his committee had carried out its assignment as far as it felt able to do, and he urged that it be discharged. There being no objection, it was ruled that the committee be discharged with thanks.

#### *The Continuing Problem of the Preservation of Newspapers*

Mr. Kuhlman asked a question as to how many of the libraries represented at the meeting had changed their subscriptions to the *New York Times* from the rag-paper edition to the film edition for purposes of reference and preservation. It was indicated, though with some uncertainty, that eight libraries have so changed.

Mr. Clapp then spoke in more general terms of the large problem of the preservation of newspapers by means of microfilm reproduction (which he felt was still with us), and he referred to the original memorandum of the Librarian of Congress on this subject which had preceded the appointment of Mr. Tate's Committee on Microfilming Cooperation. The Library of Congress, he said, was besieged with inquiries which had a direct bearing on this question, and he expressed the

view that it might be well to have a board or committee, perhaps the Board on Resources of American Libraries, to which the Library of Congress might turn for advice. Although the Tate Committee had been discharged, there was need for assistance and for planning, and the libraries must certainly get together and cooperate with respect to this matter. A suggestion was made that we look to the Information Center that had been established at the Library of Congress on the advice of the Tate Committee, but it appeared to be Mr. Clapp's view that while the center was important, something more positive was required. Mr. Coney urged that the Board on Resources be asked to appoint a subcommittee to study this question. Mr. Downs, chairman of the Board on Resources, said that he hoped the board would be favorable to such a proposal. It appeared to be the sense of the meeting that no further action should be taken by A.R.L. until it could be learned what constructive development with respect to this matter might come from a direct exchange of views between the Library of Congress and the Board on Resources.

#### *Committee on Serials in Research Fields*

This was formerly the Committee on Reproduction of Wartime Periodicals. Charles H. Brown, chairman, reported on the progress which the firm of Edwards Brothers is making with its program of facsimile reproductions of wartime periodicals.

Mr. Brown said that his committee contemplates the preparation of comprehensive lists of all periodicals which are announced for reproduction anywhere and the publication of these lists, probably in the *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries*. He said that Walter J. Johnson of New York, Springer-Verlag, and many others have announced plans for reproduction of many sets.

Mr. Brown said that on account of the dollar exchange problem, Unesco was anxious to obtain permission to reproduce certain American scientific journals in France rather than in this country, and, as a means of strengthening the hand of Unesco in this laudable enterprise, he presented a resolution which the association passed urging upon the publishers of American periodicals the desirability of their consenting to the photographic reproduction of their periodicals now out of

print for distribution and sale in soft-currency countries.

Mr. Brown said that his committee had had considerable correspondence with Unesco regarding exchanges, and he pointed out that in the Unesco *Bulletin for Libraries* there have been lists of publications available for exchange by various institutions in the United States and abroad. He urged that these lists receive the careful attention of exchange librarians.

Mr. Brown drew attention to the lists of most cited periodicals in the various fields of pure and applied sciences which had been issued by a committee of A.R.L. in 1942, based on 1939 publications. He said that his committee hoped to make arrangements for a new edition of these lists, to be based on 1949-50 publications. The association approved.

Mr. Brown especially asked that librarians who are successful in getting regularly all issues of their Russian periodicals notify him as to how they are doing it.

#### *Committee on Prices of German Books, Periodicals, and Microfilm*

Mr. Clapp, chairman, reported how this committee had arisen out of complaints presented orally to the last meeting of the association held in Cambridge in March 1949. He then went on to report the various investigations which the committee has carried on and stated that up to date little evidence has come to light that seems to justify the complaints that have been made. He accordingly concluded as follows: "The committee sees no cause for alarm on the German front and recommends no action."

#### *Committee on Research Libraries and the Library of Congress*

Mr. David, the chairman of this committee, submitted a final report the principal feature of which was a long letter from the Librarian of Congress which summarized the results at which the committee had arrived in its consideration of the half dozen problems with which it had been concerned. The contents of this letter were far too extensive to be included here. It must therefore suffice to say that the Librarian of Congress acknowledged that all assignments made to the committee had been placed in appropriate channels or

awaited the completion of important stages of development, and therefore he was willing to have the committee dismissed. The chairman, therefore, while fully acknowledging that not all of the problems submitted to the committee had been successfully resolved and that there would doubtless still be continuing need for discussion of the various problems of the research libraries and the Library of Congress, nevertheless requested that his committee be permitted to dissolve. The request was granted and the committee was dismissed with thanks.

#### *United States Book Exchange*

The executive secretary presented on behalf of the director of the U. S. Book Exchange, Inc., a very gratifying report of progress.

#### *Committee on Customs Procedures and Importation Difficulties*

Lawrence C. Powell, chairman, reported that there is some prospect of legislation which would increase from \$100 to \$250 the value of merchandise for which the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe regulations for declaration and entry. The effect would be very advantageous for libraries making importations, but it is as yet by no means certain that such favorable legislation will be enacted.

#### *A Monthly Index to United Nations Publications*

An announcement has been received that the United Nations Library will begin publication in February 1950 of a monthly index of documents under the title *United Nations Documents Index; Documents and Publications of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies*. It is intended to list and index by subjects all of the documents and publications of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies received by the United Nations Library, except restricted (confidential) materials and internal papers. The publication will be reproduced by photo-offset with a printed cover and will be 8½ x 11" in size. It is estimated that each issue will run somewhere between 75 and 100 pages. The subscription rate for the publication will be about \$8.00 in the United States and Canada.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.—  
Charles W. David, Executive Secretary.

## Annual Report of the A.C.R.L. Executive Secretary, 1949-50

This report covers the seven months (November 1949-June 1950) during which I have been your executive secretary. Like other officers, I have been concerned with the general direction of the association and not slow in making recommendations to the Board of Directors. These matters are, however, the responsibility of the President and are at most briefly mentioned here.

### Membership

The membership of the association increased from 4228 on Jan. 1, 1949, to 4649 on Jan. 1, 1950. The great increases of previous years have fallen off; future growth will be made principally through increases in the usefulness of the Association's program.

The Office of Education *Statistics of Libraries in Institutions of Higher Education, 1946-47* states that nearly 6000 professional librarians were employed in the 1340 institutions which reported. Allowances should be made for catalogers and other staff who may be interested in other divisions, for reference librarians in public libraries, for noninstitutional research libraries, for the 360 colleges which did not report, for the increase in number of professional librarians since 1946-47, and numerous lesser factors. My own guess is that we have a potential membership at this time of at least 8000 individuals and 2000 institutions. It seems fairly clear that our present membership is less than 50 per cent of what it ought to be.

It is all too apparent that some indi-

viduals and the majority of institutions do not join A.C.R.L. because of error or thoughtlessness. About five eighths of the colleges and universities (belonging to A.L.A.) are members of no division, and among these are libraries headed by members taking active part in Association affairs. It is quite likely that errors and misunderstandings by business offices are responsible for nonfiling the necessary A.C.R.L. membership slips.

No extra charge is involved in joining A.C.R.L. at the same time as A.L.A. It is necessary to fill out and send in the A.C.R.L. slip as well as the A.L.A. slip. Head librarians are therefore urged to give personal attention to this if they wish 20 per cent of their A.L.A. dues to be allotted to the A.C.R.L. treasury. If only one half of all American college and university libraries belonged to A.C.R.L., our income would be increased 30-40 per cent; if all those which are now A.L.A. members (without any present divisional membership) joined A.C.R.L., our treasury would receive approximately \$1600 extra.

The A.C.R.L. office should do follow-up work on institutional memberships. The investment would return rich dividends; unfortunately no clerical help for this could be spared during the spring.

The Membership Committee has continued to do splendid work, the expense of which has been borne by the individual members.

### Finances of the Secretary's Office

During the past year the executive secre-

tary's office was allotted \$9320 on the A.L.A. budget. This covered salaries of two people and travel. It did not cover stationery, communications, and other direct (or any indirect) expenses which are lumped in with needs of other A.L.A. offices. This \$9320 came from A.L.A. and is distinct from the 20 per cent allotment of A.C.R.L. membership dues which went into our treasury.

About \$28,000 was paid in dues by A.C.R.L. members, 1948-49. Of this, 20 per cent (about \$5750) went into our treasury. It thus appears that about 34 per cent of each membership dollar went to direct A.C.R.L. purposes (A.C.R.L. office or treasury).

Essential work was neglected for lack of clerical assistance. I have asked the American Library Association for \$2025.00 additional on the office budget to begin Sept. 1, 1950. If all this is granted, the level of A.C.R.L. support (per membership dollar) will be approximately 60 per cent and not out of line with support of the other principal divisions.

#### *College and Research Libraries*

*College and Research Libraries*, our official journal, continues to be the principal jewel in the Association crown. All credit belongs, of course, to the editorial board, led by Dr. Maurice Tauber. Subscriptions stood at 1964 in April 1950. This represents a gain of nearly 150 over April 1949 (not counting 85 free subscriptions furnished to selected foreign libraries).

Revenue from advertising (October 1949-July 1950) is approximately \$1600.

About one third of the subscriptions are from nonmembers. As revenues from subscriptions and advertising increase, we come closer to the possibility of being able to finance (with treasury help) free subscriptions to members. This happy goal still seems fairly distant but by no means impossible.

#### *Field Work*

Visits have been made to nearly 70 libraries in 17 states. Most of this travel has been done since March and almost always in connection with trips required for other purposes. While the usefulness of these visits might better be reported by the institutions visited, I believe that nearly all were useful. At a number of institutions major problems were discussed at length with either the librarian or the president. These visits provide me with a fund of information otherwise not obtainable and uncover talent for Association work.

There seems to be an understandable but unnecessary reluctance on the part of libraries and library schools to request a visit by the executive secretary. This is particularly true of library schools which are usually very glad to have Headquarters people address their students. Since travel funds are provided for such purposes on the office budget, it is often possible to arrange a number of talks in an area and so make a long journey financially practical with small or no contribution from any one school, local library association, or library. On one trip of eight days' duration I gave eight talks, attended a state library conference, and visited 15 libraries in four states. This was, of course, a tighter schedule than is normally practical since all travel of any distance was done after 10 P.M., including one full night on a bus.

During the winter and spring I spoke to several local (Chicago and vicinity) library clubs. Trips were made to California, Texas, and Louisiana to address the college and university sections of the state associations at their annual conferences. These state and regional library meetings are excellent opportunities for meeting librarians who can seldom afford to attend national conferences. A number of informal talks were given to library school classes, staff associations, and other smaller groups.

Topics of principal addresses were: "The Community Responsibilities of College and University Libraries;" "On Understanding the Reader as Well as the Book;" "The Status of Research in College and University Librarianship;" "A.C.R.L.—Your Professional Association."

I attended the regional conferences at Grand Rapids and Fort Worth, which came just after my arrival at Headquarters.

Several short articles on college and research libraries were written for handbooks on colleges and other publications.

#### *Experimental Placement Program*

The experimental placement program, which was reported in the April issue of *College and Research Libraries* and at the Midwinter Meeting, was launched in April. It operates in South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia (excluding District of Columbia suburbs), and eastern Tennessee. Experience in this limited area should indicate whether or not the plan is practical and worthy of extension. I hope the evidence will be clear in another six months. Great credit should go to the four representatives who took on this work; Mr. Rawlinson of the University of South Carolina, Mr. Christ of Duke, Mr. Dalton of the University of Virginia, and Miss Ryan of the University of Tennessee.

It is quite evident that the membership will greatly appreciate an effective, free placement service, and that we do not have the funds for salaried placement officers. The only solution is to spread the load sufficiently light to be borne by volunteers.

A good many members write that they are looking for new positions. Likewise some librarians send in notices of staff vacancies. I do what I can with such requests. In my traveling I meet many people and note any apparent special talents or abilities for placement or use on A.C.R.L. committees.

#### *Communications from Headquarters*

Now that our number has grown to nearly 5000, the use of an occasional mimeographed newsletter is impractical. The ideal is, of course, to make *College and Research Libraries* free to all. During the year ahead I hope that a communication from this office, written for *College and Research Libraries*, will be reprinted to form a brief quarterly newsletter for free distribution.

The logical channel for communications to members is the *A.L.A. Bulletin*, for which all of us pay. In the light of my experience it is not practical to count on the *Bulletin* to publish a communication, unless extremely brief, on reasonably short notice.

#### *Work with Sections and Committees*

During the past winter and spring there has been relatively little contact between Headquarters and committee chairmen. As you know, committees are authorized by the Board of Directors and appointed by the president (sectional committees by their chairman). I have been reluctant to press for information on progress of committee work, in the conviction that responsibility lay elsewhere and too much interest on my part might be misinterpreted as interference. I have worked closely with several committees.

The Headquarters office supplies membership lists to the sections and handles the mailing of ballots for those sections which have mail vote. These membership records require a sizeable amount of clerical work.

Newsletters sent out by the Junior College Libraries and Reference Librarians Sections were handled, partially or completely, in this office.

The real health of the association would seem to depend more on a wide spread of member participation and a steady production of useful research and investigation than on any other factors. I believe that

these two aims can be accomplished by the devoted, regular work of a small planning group at the top and the assignment or suggestion of topics to section chairmen for committee work. The association can tap the energies and abilities of lesser-known members more easily through the sections than any other way. Every member ought to feel that his help, as well as dues, can be used and will be appreciated.

The paucity of study and investigation by the association on college library problems should be a matter of concern to the whole membership. Recommendations to remedy this situation have been prepared for the Board of Directors.

#### *Other Educational Associations*

Among the assigned duties of this office is that of representing college and reference library interests in the councils of leaders in higher education. There are many professional associations and therefore many conferences. No one person can attend a large number without devoting most of his time and a large amount of travel money to the purpose.

During the past seven months I attended only two such nonlibrary conferences (American Council on Education and N.E.A. Fifth Annual Conference on Higher Education). I hope to do somewhat better in the year ahead. Various A.C.R.L. members with special subject interests have represented A.C.R.L. officially at several other conferences. Generally speaking, our representation at national educational conferences has not been good. It could be improved considerably by more use of the special interests and contacts of members.

#### *Ceremonials*

The American Library Association has been unfailingly cooperative in turning over to me its invitations to be officially repre-

sented at various institutional ceremonies, usually presidential inaugurations. Practice is to request some librarian who lives at not too great a distance to represent the Association. Many librarians have cooperated in this respect without the assistance of travel money. We should all be grateful to the elderly librarian who, in our behalf, sat through no less than 14 addresses at one inaugural.

Your secretary represented the American Library Association at the inauguration of President Millis of Western Reserve University in January.

#### *Foreign Visitors*

The A.C.R.L. office regularly assists librarians of foreign research libraries plan trips to American institutions, writes the necessary introductions, and assists these people in various other minor ways. These time-consuming obligations fall on your secretary as a division head in the American Library Association. Much as I would prefer to use time on other matters, there is no honest evading of this responsibility to international goodwill. It need hardly be added that contacts with these visitors are extremely pleasant and instructive.

#### *Information Services*

Requests for help on library problems are received daily. There is infinite variety to these. Some are so broad and general that adequate answer is impossible, as the request for a list of required reading books for the library (no further information), and the complaint that one problem which never seemed to be solved completely was the budget. Other queries are very specific but equally hard to answer.

In many cases the extensive vertical file material on hand produces some helpful data. In some cases I draw information from my own reading and experience, and in other cases the letters are referred to

committee chairmen or other specialists.

Many letters request help on building problems. I acknowledge all these and refer them on to Dr. Robert H. Muller, chairman of the Committee on College and University Library Buildings. He has been a great help to many with building problems. I have leaned over backwards in answering all letters on any matter, whether or not later referred elsewhere.

By and large, this office can be of considerable assistance to small libraries. Its principal potential usefulness to large libraries is probably that of support before the administration. By this I mean we can endorse a projected program as sound, or send information that other important libraries have adopted the proposed policy, etc. Of course, there is an occasional request for endorsement of a program which seems ill-advised. So far, I have escaped from such requests without embarrassment.

It is extremely important to the work of the A.C.R.L. office that college and research libraries send in copies of useful documents. Principal types desired are annual reports, staff bulletins, or other publications which give data on changes of policy, and carbon copies of library policy statements of any description.

Other documents desired are: library handbooks, statements of rules and regulations, personnel codes, classification and pay plans, library statutes or other material on

the government of the library, procedure manuals, new building plans, formal or informal library surveys, anything descriptive of interlibrary cooperation. This list might be extended.

Much of the usefulness of the A.C.R.L. office depends on its being able to furnish examples of how other libraries have handled a given situation. If more material is not sent in, I may be forced to send out a questionnaire.

#### *A.L.A.*

Your secretary is the head of an A.L.A. division and therefore takes part in staff conferences and other Headquarters enterprises. Cooperation at 50 E. Huron St. is good. A.L.A. staff members help me in many ways, and I endeavor to be equally cooperative. There is little logic and potential danger in being appointed by one body and paid by another, but no serious conflicts have arisen, thanks to the understanding of all concerned.

\* \* \* \* \*

The past seven months have been happy working months for me. Our youthful traditions for frank expression and experimentation should be continued. We need more projects and more membership participation. Along this path should lie great accomplishments and vigorous growth for the association.

## News from the Field

### *Acquisitions, Gifts, Collections*

Earlier in the year the Library of Congress acquired the manuscripts of Walter Van Tilburg Clark's *The Track of the Cat* and *The City of Trembling Leaves*. The manuscripts are in the Rare Books Division together with signed first editions of Mr. Clark's other works. The manuscripts were both written in pencil or ink in a series of 10-cent store notebooks, each page clearly showing the corrections and emendations of the author. *The Track of the Cat* fills 11 notebooks, and *The City of Trembling Leaves*, seven. By examining these notebooks students can trace the preliminary planning and procedures followed by Mr. Clark in writing his novels. For *The Track of the Cat*, Mr. Clark first listed all of his characters and described for himself the full history of each one to the moment when the novel opens. This background material is represented in the novel merely by suggestion. The manuscript also contains a map of the ranch and valley setting where the action takes place. The author further outlined for himself the total action of the novel, summarizing it in several pages. This summary served as a guide for the writing of the first draft. The products of the creative writer are frequently well known to readers. It is seldom possible, however, for the interested reader to study and understand the writer's method of creation.

Radcliffe College Library recently received seven scrapbooks concerned with the activities of Julia Ward Howe, author of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," abolitionist, author, and reformer. Included in the Julia Ward Howe material is a collection of her letters about the women's movement; copies of 10 letters Mrs. Howe wrote to the *Chicago Tribune* about a trip to Europe in 1877-78; together with letters and papers describing her work as chief of the Department of Women's Work in the World's Exposition in New Orleans, December 1884-85. The scrapbooks cover Mrs. Howe's activities between 1886 and 1910. The material, a gift from Rosalind Richards of Gardiner, Me.,

has been added to the Women's Archives, Radcliffe College Library, a research collection concerning the historical role and contributions of women in the United States.

The School of Medicine and the School of Law at Northwestern University are seeking to raise \$640,000 for their libraries as their share of the \$8,250,000 which alumni and friends of Northwestern hope to present to the University on its 100th anniversary. The alumni of the School of Medicine plans to establish an endowment of \$500,000 for the Archibald Church Medical Library. The money would be used to maintain and build the collection, and to increase its present services. The Law Alumni Association hopes to raise a total of \$140,000 to complete the John Henry Wigmore Library Fund which was initiated in 1948. Approximately one third of the total would be used for immediate needs in the Elbert H. Gary Law Library. The remainder would be used over a 10-year period for the purchase of books. Friends of the university wishing to support Northwestern's libraries through the centennial program may send their contributions to the Centennial Committee, Pearsons Hall, Evanston, Ill.

The Pennsylvania State College Library has received an appropriation from the General State Authority for \$1,408,000 to be used for the construction of an addition to the present building which was erected in 1940. Preliminary plans call for an increase in the book stacks, additional reading areas, and the concentration of public service areas on the first floor.

A storage depot, to house old or little-used materials kept by libraries of the Rocky Mountain area and plains states, is being established in Denver. The depot, situated in the old Federal Medical Center, is a central depository designed to help libraries of the area combat the problems of crowded shelves and high storage costs. Dr. James G. Hodgson, director of libraries at Colorado A. and M. and chairman of the Bibliographical Center for Research, which is in charge of the depot, has stated that approximately 24,000

linear feet of shelving have been installed or are on order. Most of this is 24-inch shelving, intended for storage of over-sized periodicals and newspapers. The storage depot was authorized at the annual meeting of the Bibliographical Center on Mar. 18, 1950.

The Alderman Library, University of Virginia, has recently acquired three subject collections of importance. The first is the Alexander McGay-Smith Collection on Music, the second is the Paul B. Victorius Darwin Collection, and the third is the Thomas W. Streeter Collection on Railways. The Streeter Collection contains material, much of which is quite rare, on the railways of the southeastern section of the United States.

The manuscript collection at the University of Virginia Library now contains more than three million pieces. One of its recent acquisitions was the papers of John Hartwell Cocke, one of the founders of the university and the friend of several early presidents of the United States.

#### *Conferences, Curricula, Scholarships*

The Unesco seminar meeting in Malmo, Sweden from July 24 through Aug. 19, 1950 will concern itself with "The Role of Libraries in Adult Education." The purpose of the seminar is to study and discuss library adult education techniques, methods, policies and programs with a view to stimulating the development of library educational services in all member states. The seminar is limited to 50 participants selected by Unesco national commissions or national co-operating bodies and federal offices of education, in cooperation with national library associations.

The following scholarships are available at the University of Minnesota for the year 1950-51: (1) The John C. Hutchinson Scholarship of \$300, given by Lura C. Hutchinson in memory of her father, will be awarded for study in library science in the Division of Library Instruction. Applicants will be judged on the basis of aptitude, personal qualifications and need. (2) The H. W. Wilson Scholarship Fund is also available to students in the Division of Library Instruction. Amounts available under the Wilson Scholarship will be based upon need but will not be less than tuition. Applications for both of these scholarships should be sent to the director of the

Division of Library Instruction, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Plans for Faculty Research Fellowships to help young college faculty members, selected for their outstanding research ability, to do original work in the social sciences were announced in February by Dr. Pendleton Herring, president of the Social Science Research Council. A grant of \$465,000 has been received from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to finance the fellowship program for a five-year period. The fellowships are designed to enable young social scientists with exceptional research ability to advance their research activities early in their teaching careers. The fellowships will provide substantial financial aid to recipients for approximately three years. In each case, cooperative financial arrangements will be worked out with a recipient's college or university so he will be relieved of half of his teaching duties in order to do sustained research. The aim of the fellowships is to demonstrate "the possibility of combining significant research and effective teaching." The fellowships will be awarded each year to a total of seven men and women, not over 35 years of age, chosen from the whole range of the social science faculties in American colleges and universities. The council hopes to award the first Faculty Fellowships for the academic year 1950-51. Recipients will be selected for their past achievements as well as their promise of future accomplishments on problems involving the formulation and empirical testing of general hypotheses concerning human relations and social institutions. Every candidate must have a doctoral degree or its equivalent in one of the social science fields, must be a regular faculty member of a college or university in the United States and must be nominated or endorsed by the head of his department or dean. Detailed information on the fellowships may be obtained from Elbridge Sibley, executive associate of the council at its Washington office at 726 Jackson Place, N. W.

A work conference open to college teachers of library research methods, and college librarians interested in instructional problems will be held at Teachers College for three weeks, July 10-29. Designed for an experienced group, it offers an opportunity to share experiences, study common problems, and prepare instructional materials. Members of the group may enrol for credit or may

attend on a noncredit basis. For further information regarding the work conference write to Ethel M. Feagley, Teachers College Library, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th St., New York 27, N.Y.

An international conference of the world's leading specialists in the field of Portuguese and Brazilian studies will be held at the Library of Congress, October 4-7. The principal purpose of the gathering, known as the International Colloquium on Luso-Brazilian studies, will be to provide an opportunity for consideration of the present and future development of research and teaching in this subject field.

The New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University is sponsoring a special summer seminar in personnel administration for business and industrial personnel. The program is under the direction of Professor Earl Brooks and its aim is to help those persons who have had business experience but lack extensive training in personnel administration and industrial relations. The Personnel Administration Seminar meets daily, except Saturday, for a six-weeks period from July 3 to August 12.

The New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations is also offering, this summer, a course in audio-visual methods. Persons registering for the course will receive instruction in the effectiveness of audio-visual methods as a means of communication, the proper methods of using audio-visual materials, the effective operation of various audio-visual devices, and an appreciation of the place of audio-visual materials in modern mass communication. Instruction will be given in the operation of sound-slide machines, motion picture projectors, wire recorders and transcription players, and how to make the most effective use of posters, models, and charts and graphs. For information concerning the course write to the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

**Publications** An album of phonograph records, telling in dramatic documentary style the living story of the United Nations is being produced at Lake Success and will be ready for sale to schools, libraries and community organizations this summer. The origin, scope, aims and achievements of the United Nations will be

described, and the material used will be undated and have permanent value. It is hoped that many schools and community organizations in the United States and Canada will have a copy of the album by October 24, "United Nations Day." Inquiries about the documentary record album can be sent to the Education Section or to the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, Department of Public Information, United Nations, Lake Success, N.Y.

Earlier in the year the Library of Congress published *A Résumé of Public Laws Enacted during First Session of Eighty-First Congress*. This document was intended to fill a need, long felt by persons working closely with federal legislation. It presents currently a general view of the public laws enacted during a session of Congress. It was issued as No. 79 in the Library's Public Affairs Bulletin series. This type of document bridges the gap which has existed between the appearance of the slip law and the printing of the Statutes at Large. The bulletin contains summaries in general language of the legal effects of the 440 public

(Continued on page 280)

"Bound to Please"

**QUALITY  
LIBRARY BINDING**  
combined with  
**PROMPT SERVICE**

Just mail a postal card  
and our Representative  
will call immediately

**The HECKMAN BINDERY, Inc.**  
NORTH MANCHESTER, INDIANA

## Personnel

GEORGE C. ALLEZ, 52, director of the Library School of the University of Wisconsin, died April 26 from a heart attack at his home in Madison. President E. B. Fred of the University of Wisconsin issued this statement on the death of Professor Allez:

"The sudden death of Professor George C. Allez is a saddening blow to the entire university staff.

"Professor Allez came to us in 1938 as assistant director of the Library School. His rich background of training and experience included degrees from the University of Washington and Columbia University, and the librarianship of the Central State Teachers College at Stevens Point. He was made associate director in 1939 and director in 1941.

"Since that time the performance and prestige which he has built into our Library School has resulted in recognition from students and colleagues alike. Enrollment is now the largest in the history of the school. Only recently the university faculty approved the granting of master of arts and master of science degrees by the school. Under Professor Allez' direction the University of Wisconsin Library School reached new peaks in teaching, research, and public service.

"Besides directing the school, Professor Allez found time to make significant contributions to professional periodicals and serve as president of the Association of American Library Schools.

"Professor Allez will be missed on the campus, but his spirit of service will live on in the lives of hundreds of former students and the citizens they serve."

Professor Allez was born Sept. 25, 1897 in Bath, N.Y., but grew up in the State of Washington where his family moved. He was a veteran of World War I, serving overseas for two years.

He was president of the Wisconsin Library Association in 1937, and of the Association of

American Library Schools, 1947-48, and a contributor to numerous professional periodicals. —*Rachel K. Schenk.*

MARGARET FIELD, engineering librarian at Oregon State College since 1942, died in Corvallis, Ore., on Apr. 4, 1950, after an illness of one day. Miss Field was graduated from Carleton College in 1919, and attended the University of Illinois Library School during 1928-29, receiving the bachelor's degree there in 1929. She served as librarian of Dakota Wesleyan University from 1929-32, resigning for further study at the School of Librarianship at the University of California. After being awarded a master's degree at California in 1934 she became the librarian of the Lewiston, Idaho Public Library, remaining in that post until she became engineering librarian at Oregon State College.

Although Miss Field had not prepared for work in the technical and scientific fields she developed, during her period of service at Oregon State College, an extensive knowledge of the literature of the engineering fields and particularly of the bibliographical services and the reference tools of the various engineering branches. She was active in the work of the Engineering School Libraries Section of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, and for the past several years had been a member of the A.C.R.L. Committee on Publications. She contributed significantly to professional literature. An extensive bibliography on the electric heating of houses, compiled by her, was published by the Bonneville Power Administration in 1946. In her untimely death the library and engineering professions have lost a valuable and highly effective worker.—*William H. Carlson.*

C. Louise Roewekamp, librarian of the East Los Angeles Junior College and active in the Junior College Libraries Section of A.C.R.L., died on May 6, 1950.

## Appointments

Dr. Raymund L. Zwemer, executive secretary of the National Academy of Sciences and

of the National Research Council since 1947, has been appointed chief of the Science Di-

vision of the Library of Congress and consultant in biology.

David K. Berninghausen, head of Cooper Union's Division of Libraries, has been appointed an Education Fellow in the Harvard Graduate School of Education for 1950-51. During Mr. Berninghausen's leave of absence, Harold C. Whitford will be acting librarian.

T. D. Kendrick, keeper of the Department of British Antiquities of the British Museum, has been named director and principal librarian of the museum in succession to Sir John Forsdyke, who is retiring after holding the directorship for 14 years.

Dr. Gertrude Rathbone Jasper is on special leave from Hunter College in New York to become assistant professor of library science at Pratt Institute.

Lucille Simcoe has resigned her position as acting head of the Reference Department in Duke University Library to become order librarian at the Virginia State Library.

Richard W. Morin, executive officer of Dartmouth College since 1948, has succeeded Nathaniel L. Goodrich as librarian of the college. Mr. Goodrich is retiring after serving as Dartmouth's librarian since 1912.

Dr. Hazel Pulling, of the University of Southern California, has been appointed assistant dean of the Library School of Florida State University at Tallahassee.

Walter W. Wright, formerly head of the Circulation Department of the University of Pennsylvania Library, has been promoted to the position as assistant librarian of the Service Division, succeeding Arthur T. Hamlin.

Stanley McElderry has joined the staff of the University of Minnesota as circulation librarian and assistant professor.

Frances L. Moak, formerly librarian of the Charity Hospital School of Nursing in New Orleans, is now librarian of the State Teachers College in Livingston, Alabama.

## Retirements

Harriet E. Howe retires this year from the directorship of the University of Denver School of Librarianship with the title of professor emeritus. Beginning with the summer session, Donald E. Strout will become director of the school in addition to his present duties as director of the University Libraries. He

holds the Ph.D. degree in Classics from the University of Illinois and took his library degree later at the University of Michigan. Mr. Strout came to Denver in the fall of 1948 from the Division of Library Instruction of the University of Minnesota.

## News from the Field

(Continued from page 278)

laws enacted during the first session of the eighty-first Congress. Copies may be purchased from the Card Division, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C., at 70¢ each.

Other recent Library of Congress publications are *Planning National Defense, 1950 to 1970*, by S. Arthur Devan (Public Affairs Bulletin No. 75); *Newspapers Currently Received, September, 1949* (free to libraries, apply to Information and Publications Office); *The United States Capitol: A Selected List of References*, compiled by Alice Duncan Brown; *Fiscal and Budgetary Phases of Research: A Selected List of References*, compiled by Helen D. Jones; and *The Study and Teaching of Slavic Languages: A Selected List of Refer-*

*ences*, compiled by John T. Dorosh.

The U. S. Department of State has issued *International Protection of Works of Art and Historic Monuments*, by Charles de Visscher; English translation edited by Ardelia R. Hall. (Order from Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D.C., price 25¢.)

Aslib (4, Palace Gate, London, W.S.) has issued another of its *Guides to Sources of Information in Great Britain*. This is No. 4 "Textiles and Allied Interests." (Price, 12s. 6d. net, 10s. to Aslib members). A new feature of this latest guide is that details of the classification used in the libraries covering this field have been included, as well as details of their document reproduction facilities.

# Review Articles

## Scientific Information

*The Royal Society Scientific Information Conference, 21 June-2 July 1949. Report and Papers Submitted.* London, Royal Society, 1948, 723p. 26s.

Since the close of the war the number of articles and publications concerned with the problem of bibliographic control has increased to such an extent that most individuals have felt snowed under. The publication under review, however, is one which contains such a mine of information that it merits consideration and study.

The Scientific Information Conference was the outcome of a recommendation passed by the Royal Society Empire Scientific Conference of 1946 calling for a conference "to examine the possibilities of improvement in existing methods of collection, indexing and distribution of scientific literature and of the extension of existing abstracting services." Some 230 delegates and observers were present from the United Kingdom, the Overseas Commonwealth and the United States. "The Presentation of Scientific Information," pages 26-44, was the principal address at the opening session. Given by Professor E. N. da C. Andrade, it was a scholarly historical treatment of the problem since the earliest times. The conference was organized in four sections to consider and to discuss various aspects of the problem. Editors were appointed some months beforehand to take charge of each section, and they had with assistance from others, prepared and circulated 46 papers for advance consideration. During the conference 16 working parties considered 42 specific topics and later made some 70 recommendations to the Royal Society.

Section I of the *Conference*, under the editorship of Professor J. D. Bernal, dealt with the publication and distribution of papers containing original work. Working Party IA examined the present format of scientific publications, (Paper 14, page 368-69 shows that an examination of 176 botanical journals revealed 102 different sizes) and made recommendations for the adoption of suggested standards in keeping with those then being formulated by the International Standards Organization. Methods of reproduction of

scientific papers were also reviewed and recommendations made. Working Party IB studied the importance of editorial distribution and other factors in relation to the length of scientific communications. (Paper 2, pages 253-58, J. D. Bernal's "Provisional Scheme for Central Distribution of Scientific Publications" drew a storm of protest from many sources.) Working Party IC was concerned with the grouping of scientific communications within existing journals. It was recognized that the scatter of papers on essentially the same subject in journals is very wide. (Paper 46, pages 589-637, dealing with the use of scientific literature, showed that the distribution of reading in various journals was significant: 1821 papers described as carefully read by a group were from 427 different journals; but the distribution of papers consulted among journals varied enormously, one fourth of the papers being found in six journals, one half in 30, three quarters in 100, and the remaining quarter in 327.) This emphasizes the "law of scattering" suggested by Bradford from studies of the actual distribution in journals of papers covering particular topics and shows that his conclusions apply equally strongly to papers actually read. Working Party ID dealt with the question of organization of publication of original papers and mechanisms for their distribution. Working Party IE had the task of exploring delays in publication and in the availability of already published material. The recommendations made to the Royal Society by Section I while embodying no radical changes do indicate what is required for the improvement of the production and distribution of original scientific material:

Section II of the *Conference*, under the editorship of Sir David Chadwick took up the task of what could be done to improve the arrangements for issuing and using abstracts to convey current awareness of the availability and relevance of scientific papers. The keynote of the conference was service to science and the scientific worker. The sole justification for the existence of abstracts is to serve the scientist. Yet preliminary preparation for the conference revealed that there is an almost

complete lack of factual information on how scientific men in the different branches of science actually used abstracts and for what purposes. Factual information was collected from many abstracting agencies and some inquiries were made into the use of abstracts. The whole subject was referred to three working parties. One party was instructed to examine the place of abstracts in the service of scientific workers, their relation to other forms of service—such as reviews, bibliographies, etc.—and to review the existing services. A second party, composed mostly of representatives of the abstracting agencies, compared their methods, techniques, and practices. The third group looked into the future. From information supplied on a small scale, (Paper 20), it would appear that abstracts account for about one third of the inquiries for original papers. One type of user of abstracts seemed to be increasing, that is, the professional searcher of the literature, particularly librarians in commercial organizations. In Britain such an individual is called an "information officer." In the United States we call them "literature specialists" or "bibliographical assistants." A diagrammatic representation of the interrelations of science and the scope of existing abstracting agencies prepared by H. J. T. Ellingham, (Paper 27), showed at a glance present gaps and overgaps in English abstracts. It was found that in general abstracts were of two types: the informative or detailed type, or the indicative or brief type. Further it was brought out that the abstract journals differed in function, type, scope and finances. They are not thus capable of easy recasting or reshuffling. Some overlap between abstract services was held to be desirable, when the services cater to readers having different interests. Such overlap is distinct from duplication. For this reason a single set of abstracts produced by a central office would not suffice for universal use. It was recommended to the Royal Society that it be invited to consult with the various abstracting agencies and to set up a standing consultative committee of abstracting organizations for mutual exchange of views and generally to promote cooperation.

Section III of the *Conference* was concerned with indexing and other library services. These problems include what is normally understood by librarianship, and also go beyond it. Dr. J. E. Holmstrom, general edi-

tor, summarized the scope of the section in his "General Remarks" pages 77-93. Section III dealt with the provision for retrospective searching—that is, the problem of how to arrange literature references in such a way that a searcher will turn up those references that will satisfy the need for any particular request for information. The problem of bibliographic control in the sciences is to make certain that when a scientist needs to know what has already been done and thought regarding any topic whatever, he can be given quickly the pertinent references, not only those for material in his own library, but also for those appearing in any existing publication.

Since there is no way of knowing which of the millions of items already published or being published are likely to be needed, it is necessary to devise economical techniques for the mass processing of literature references in order to give access to specific information. Holmstrom lists four specific methods now being used:

1. Indexing the names of subjects in alphabetical order, e.g., L.C. subject headings or Index to Chemical Abstracts.

2. Classifying the subjects under symbols which serve to pinpoint their positions in a logically constructed map of knowledge, e.g., L. C. or Dewey, or the U.D.C.

3. Coding the subjects under symbols which can then be mechanically selected, e.g., punched cards, Bush-Shaw Rapid Selector, or UNIVAC.

4. Coding the shapes of certain classes of objects under symbols which can be mechanically selected, e.g., the Dyson or Gordon-Kendall Davison systems of chemical notation.

Six working parties discussed the work of Section III under the following headings: (1) Classification, (2) Methods of reproduction, (3) Mechanical indexing, (4) Training and employment in information work, (5) Guides to the literature, and (6) Translations. In this connection two new and interesting developments were brought before the conference. One was an adaptation of punched cards invented by Dr. J. Samain of Paris. This involves a typewriter-like keyboard whereby up to 24 six-letter words can be punched directly in a single card and a selector able to pick out those cards which carry any desired word or combination regardless of the position or sequence in which these occur on particular cards. The second was a method

of reproduction—a Dutch process of semi-dry diazo printing, pages 147-49. This method, already in operation for the dissemination of abstracts on "fiches" (folded index slips) has implications for publishing and for card production in libraries.

Section IV under the editorship of H. Munro Fox considered "Reviews," "Recent Advances," and "Annual Reports of Progress." It was pointed out that there are two main purposes for these types of publications. The first is to gather together and present for the specialist the progress which has been made in a whole subject during a period of time or to review the state of knowledge in a particular branch of a subject. The second is to provide scientists with knowledge of what has been going on, not so much in their own field but

in other fields. Reviews may well be written to suit several levels of interest. For example, a review of a particular aspect of physical chemistry may be written for physical chemists, for chemists in general, in a simpler form for other scientists or even in a still simpler form for the intelligent layman.

The whole conference points up the fact that scientists have evolved in the course of years a remarkably effective system for providing themselves with information, but the system is suffering from strain and requires renovating and strengthening. In order to do this there needs to be more research into how scientific information is used.—*Thomas P. Fleming, College of Physicians and Surgeons and School of Library Service, Columbia University.*

## Source Material on Meteorology

*Meteorological Abstracts and Bibliography*, Vol. 1, no. 1. Boston, American Meteorological Society. January 1950. \$3.00 per year.

The important role played by military aviation in the settlement of the last world conflict awakened much interest in aeronautics and allied sciences. Meteorology, in particular, rose to a position of great significance in the field of applied science. College and research librarians were besieged by demands for comprehensive source material in meteorology.

Professional meteorologists realized that the poorly organized material was a definite handicap in the pursuit of basic research and in the exchange of ideas in their field. Technical librarians soon recognized the gaps in their reference collection: (1) There was no comprehensive meteorological bibliography being published anywhere in the world, and (2) there was no meteorological abstracting service comparable to those existing in nearly all the other fields of science.

*Meteorological Abstracts and Bibliography* vol. 1, no. 1, dated January 1950, sponsored by Geophysical Research Directorate, A.F.C.-R.L. and the American Meteorological Society, with the cooperation of the Library of Congress, is the latest of many sincere attempts to provide a comprehensive, international, bibliographic and abstracting service for meteorology.

Each issue will contain: (1) A review of 20 to 30 scientific journals, part of an asymp-

totic plan to evaluate the contribution to meteorology of some 15,000 technical journals; (2) approximately 150 abstracts from material of current interest; (3) a cumulative annotated bibliography on a special phase of meteorology [vol. 1, no. 1, Atmosphere Pollution (240 entries), Aerobiology, Artificial Precipitation, Hail, Tornadoes, etc. to follow.]

M. K. Rigby, outstanding American bibliographer, editor, and Dr. C. E. P. Brooks, dean of British meteorologists, corresponding editor, have done a creditable job on their first issue. Important features of this journal are: international coverage; objective evaluation of periodicals in the light of their contributions to the field of meteorology; succinct annotations; and an excellent index.

The *MAB* subject heads each bibliographic entry. It is the only permanent international abstracting journal to have such a feature. These subject headings, however, are too specific for the small and medium-sized libraries, and the large and highly specialized libraries will have to make a conversion before integrating *MAB* subject headings with their catalogs. These subject headings are also inconsistent, some are qualified by the term "meteorology." Others that obviously should be qualified are not. This failing and other problems, e.g., the magnitude of the field to be covered, and the journal's lack of that prestige which comes only with age and tradition, will be solved with the passage of time.

However, the inauguration of this journal is important to librarians. It will be an aid in acquisitions work and cataloging—an invaluable reference tool in a scientific field

which, heretofore, has had inadequate coverage.—*Edward J. Doherty, Jr., Geophysical Research Library, Watertown (Mass.) Arsenal.*

## Library Education

*Education for Librarianship. Papers Presented at the Library Conference, University of Chicago, August 16-21, 1948.* Edited by Bernard Berelson. Chicago, American Library Association, 1949. 307p. \$4.00.

After nearly three decades of relative stability, education for librarianship has become an area of change and experiment. The flux of new thinking on library education has provided a theme for innumerable books, pamphlets, and periodical articles. It has been the subject of at least a score of conferences and meetings. As an area which reflects the whole complexity of the profession, each issue involved has found scores of highly vocal discussants frequently reflecting very differing points of view. As Dr. Berelson's "Introduction" to the report of this conference indicates, these new patterns of thought on library education as they have developed since 1946 represent as significant a period as any other in our history. Library education very appropriately became, then, the subject for the conference of 1948 at the University of Chicago.

The particular contribution of this meeting to its subject lies in part in its three distinctive characteristics: first, in the preliminary determination to confine it to general problems of library education rather than to allow it to be dissipated in consideration of perhaps temporary experimentation; second, in the inclusion of library practitioners rather than the professional educator in presenting the subject; and third, in employing a discussant to bring some ready evaluation to each paper presented. This third device would seem to have gone far in bringing to the report of the conference more continuity of thought than is usually possible with such a medium.

Sixteen papers were presented at the conference, and these were arranged in five general groups. The first group on "General Education and Backgrounds" includes the role of the professional school, educational problems of allied professions and historical and

foreign aspects of the subject. A second division, "Preparatory Education," was a paper on preprofessional education. The third group entitled, "Professional Education for Librarianship," included presentations of the problem peculiar to public libraries, academic institutions, service to children and youth, special librarianship, and a general summary of issues. The fourth, "Special Problems," included advanced study and research, clerical and subprofessional employment, and administrative problems of library education. The final group, "General Summaries," consisted of "The Non-Librarian Inquirer," (Robert D. Leigh); "The Practicing Librarian," (Luther H. Evans); and "The Library Educator," (J. Periam Danton).

A conference of such breadth carrying the differing theses of 16 major presentations and 11 discussants is impossible to summarize. Some issues emerge, however, as providing the structure of basic problems of library education. These include: The stratification of library education (and a correspondent stratification of library positions); general library education as opposed to specialized library education; preprofessional and postprofessional education; the quality and number of library schools; the academic point at which various types of library education should occur, and the length of various types of programs; the relationship of library education to the field of practice; and the role of the Board of Education for Librarianship and other interested bodies.

Quite aside from its necessarily speculative nature, this conference follows a trend in a number of recent meetings where the presentation of problems is sharpened by definite recommendations and proposals. As Berelson points out, this conference had neither authority nor mandate to recommend action, yet from it came a body of specific proposals. These are:

1. That the number of library schools be sharply reduced in order to improve the quality of the remaining schools.

2. That an exchange of senior personnel be effected between the schools and the practicing field of librarianship.

3. That a definite (and specified) system of training for the subprofessional and clerical workers in libraries be instituted, with all its implications for the profession generally.

4. That a research program in librarianship be planned, at least within each advanced school, for the most effective and economical development of knowledge in the field.

5. That library schools jointly develop a series of examinations to test the possession of a general education by the applicant for admission.

6. That library schools inaugurate a system of intensive (and specified) preparation for special librarianship.

7. That library schools reorganize their programs to take account of the concept of continuing education throughout the librarian's professional career.

8. That the basic specialized professional training of librarians working with the young (children's and young people's librarians in public libraries, school librarians, and teacher-librarians) be the same.

The series of annual conferences sponsored by the Graduate Library School has provided a significant vehicle for the focusing of attention upon professional areas of major concern. The report of this last conference upholds the tradition of provocative and informed discussion of perhaps what is now the most critical area of the profession. To the body of recent literature and to other conferences on the subject, it provides perhaps the most complete general summary that has appeared to date. If one is to find fault with the report of the conference at all, it might lie in a regret for the overlong interval between the conference itself, and the publication of the printed volume covering it.—*Kenneth R. Shaffer, School of Library Science, Simmons College.*

*Librarianship: Essays on Applied Bibliography.* By Raymond Irwin. London, Grafton, 1949, 131p. 8s.6d.

Were this reviewer not a regular reader of the British library journals he might have taken Mr. Irwin seriously. For one might well get the impression from the initial chapters that while American librarians are still naively asking questions about library training

their British colleagues have expertly found the answers. Judging from the articles, editorials and correspondence in the British journals it is evident that the pros and cons of library education are vigorously being debated there. In the field of library training, both in the United States and in England, educators are raising questions, seeking answers, and projecting further questions leading from the speculative answers. And so the unsuspecting reader of this book should not carry away the impression as cautioned above. Mr. Irwin does make some harsh statements but then rallies with such expressions as "These words are perhaps unfairly hard . . ." More of his likes and dislikes later, however.

The author dissects the persistent American pursuit for a "philosophy" of librarianship and arrives at the conclusion that we are victims of some will-o'-the-wisp. For, as he sees it, there is no such thing. If there is no "philosophy" of librarianship, what *are* we seeking? Upon what foundation shall our programs of library education be based? Mr. Irwin is of the opinion that we should seek the purposive directions in librarianship, the necessary underpinning, its locale, its limitations. Evidently he holds a very pragmatic view, for the one question which dominates throughout is: Will it work? That still begs the central question. Since we are an academic profession and, to be sure, the curriculum in library science is offered in an academic institution, there still remains the question: Do we know, at least, what shall be the corpus of knowledge which will provide the underpinning for prospective librarians? Quite simple. The answer is "applied bibliography." And, Mr. Irwin proceeds to define applied bibliography so that it includes precisely those subjects which constitute the traditional curriculum in American library schools. It is not quite up to date, however, for there is no provision for subjects which deal with reading interests and abilities or mass media of communication.

The author inflates his work in the very first sentence of the "Prologue," thus: "These essays grew out of a study of the writings of American librarians during the last 30 years on the subject of professional training for librarianship." This "study" consists merely of a few snatches from the works of Danton and Wheeler. No mention is made of the contributions of Williamson, Howe, Reece,

Hostetter, Wilson, White and others. There is but a sentence taken from the Metcalf-Osborn-Russell volume on library education. It is, therefore, neither a summary, nor an overview, nor an analysis, nor a critique of American library education. It is merely a propounding by the author of his own thoughts on the substance of training courses for librarians.

Mr. Irwin is pleased with several things: the relationship of education and librarianship; the library's responsibility in the adult education movement; the potential values of subject departmentation in libraries; and, with his own educational program at the University of London School of Librarianship. Mr. Irwin seems to find displeasure in other things relative to programs of library education in the United States; psychological foundations; statistical investigations and measurement in libraries; public administration; and, evidently, the spirit of scientific inquiry so well advanced by the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago.

This reviewer hopes that our British friends will not, through reading Mr. Irwin's book,

get the impression that all of the 34 library schools in the United States are engaged in soul-searching. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Unfortunately, we should have to admit to our British friends that there has been more band-wagon-jumping than soul-searching among the schools.

One third of the volume is devoted to discussions on classification of books and the essential freedoms in which librarianship thrives. They are commendable discussions but quite unrelated to the central theme of the book. The rationalized explanation in the "Epilogue" is unconvincing on this point.

On the whole this is a pedestrian work, especially when placed beside Pierce Butler's book and the recent volume on *Education for Librarianship* under Dr. Berelson's excellent editorship. It is a temperamental discourse, highly subjective, and lacking in depth. Mr. Irwin is undoubtedly capable of a far better performance and let us hope that his rich experiences as director of the University of London School of Librarianship will find expression in a better book.—Nathaniel Stewart, Pratt Institute Library School.



More Than Three Quarters Of A Century Experience In  
Serving College and Research Libraries  
**REBINDING BOOKS AND BINDING PERIODICALS**

- Careful collation and reporting of incomplete volumes.
- Sewing adaptable to the kind and condition of the paper.
- Expert handling of special work—hinging plates, restoration of old leather bindings, portfolios, etc.

**PROMPT SERVICE**

We shall be glad to send full information on request

**HERTZBERG CRAFTSMEN** DES MOINES  
IOWA

rary  
d in  
cher  
ould  
that  
than

dis-  
the  
ship  
sion  
e c  
n in  
oint.  
, es-  
ler's  
for  
llent  
urse,  
Mr.  
etter  
rich  
y of  
d ex-  
vari,

d

S

RIES